Christian Education

Vol. XXXII

SEPTEMBER, 1949

No. 3

BERNARD J. MULDER Editor

Published in March, June, September and December 36 East Main Street, Somerville, New Jersey By National Protestant Council on Higher Education 808 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

*1

Reentered as second-class matter June, 1948 at the Post Office at Somerville, N. J. under the Act of March 3, 1879. Request for reentry at Somerville, New Jersey is pending. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postag. provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 18, 1918. The subscription price is \$2.00 per annum. Single copies, regular issue 50 cents.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Bearing of Religious Orientation on the Curriculum of General Education in the Church Related College	173
Wanted—Christian Teachers for Christian Colleges	182
All Things Are Possible	187
An Experiment in Christian LivingKeith Bridston	193
Who Is Christianizing Our Children?George Zuidema	200
The Crown of Liberal ArtsJean Cananaugh	211
The Ethic of Self Realization in Relation to Christian Education	214
Aims of College Courses in ReligionL. B. Matthews	226
Trends in Giving and SpendingJames A. McDill	231
Making a College More ChristianMyron F. Wicke	235

Christian Education

Vol. XXXII

SEPTEMBER, 1949

No. 3

The Bearing of Religious Orientation on the Curriculum of General Education in the Church Related College

A. R. KEPPEL

THE task of higher education, particularly higher education as offered by our so-called church-related colleges, must be to give to learners a religious orientation, a central and basic religious core that transcends all knowledge and all life.

In the consideration of this theme, the following definition of terms shall obtain:

"Religious orientation" shall mean: finding one's religious bearings, the establishment of religious bench marks, finding one's place and service in the local church either as prospective lay members or as professional workers, the relation of the religious dynamic to all of life.

"The Curriculum of General Education" shall mean the ntire program of the educational institution (apart from professional and strictly vocational training), i.e., the required course of study, the elective courses and the co-called extracurricular activities of campus and off-campus life.

Obviously, the mere reference to church-relatedness on the part of an educational institution conveys the inference that its educational objective is or should be bound to religion as a focal and motivating ideal. This does not necessarily imply that its formal curriculum is teeming with formal courses in religion or in religious education. It does mean, however, that the resultant

Dr. Keppel is President of Catawba College, Salisbury, North Carolina.

development of its students must involve a religious orientation as clear-cut and as comprehensive as any scientific or technical knowledge is or can be made. It means that general education dare not be apart from religion, but that it must be a part of it. It means that the sense of values which becomes part and parcel of the students' educational development must comprehend those values of the eternal truths which stem from the Creator and Sovereign of all life. And it means more than this; it means that every precept and every attitude and every motive of the life and work of man must be directly and logically related to this core objective and dynamic.

Theoretically, there are few administrators of so-called church-related colleges who would fail to concur in such a position. Yet, we all know that there are not many who prove this philosophy by means of their curricula of general education. Education, even in church-related schools, has become secularized. Perhaps much of this secularization is the result of the keen competition which so-called "religious" schools have faced in their effort to keep pace with state or public institutions, which admittedly divorce religion from education in their desperate effort to maintain a complete separation of church and state. Obviously, this is not a valid reason, but it is an undeniable fact. Perhaps, however, the chief reason for such secularization of church-related schools lies in the fact that this very focal point of religion in life has lost its dynamic in the lives of those who govern and control much of American higher education.

In too many of our so-called church-related schools there seems to be no conscious effort made nor any considerable training offered to help the student understand his responsibility as an active member of his local church at his particular stage of development. Such consciousness on the part of the school is, however, essential to the student's adequate and full Christian growth, whether he may ultimately find his place in the church's laity or in its professional corps of workers. One of the school's all-important tasks, therefore, is to stimulate its students to active participation and to train them for efficient service in their local churches and in their larger Christian relationships. This stimulation and this training must be focused to their particular

THE BEARING OF RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION

present level or levels of development as well as toward their future needs and their potentialities.

II

Religious orientation in the curricula of general education in our church-related colleges seems to fall into four categories or classifications: (1) Formal required course in religion and in religious education. (2) The purposeful interpretation of the religious core and of the religious dynamic in all courses of all departments. (3) The establishment and maintenance on the campus and in all campus activities of a Christian atmosphere and a Christian spirit, created by and reflected in the type and content of extracurricular activities. (4) A conscious and purposeful correlation of college and community life, especially in relation to the program and activity of local churches.

(1) Formal required courses in religion and in religious education.

The practice of institutions in this respect is again governed largely by the basic philosophy and objectives which they consciously or unconsciously reflect. In some institutions, where a deep religious conviction obtains, such specific courses constitute a part of the required curriculum. But in other institutions, where no deep religious conviction obtains, often required courses in religion are also comprehended as a sort of pious front and conscience easement. And so one never can quite know the real incentive. Many institutions have established a core curriculum which embraces required work in religion even as it demands required work in other cultural and technical departments.

Although such required formal courses in religion guarantee nothing specific in terms of religious orientation, yet it would seem to require courses in all areas except religion would obviously result in a negative psychological effect on the student in terms of the basic importance of religion in life. It would seem clear, therefore, that required courses in religion, taught by competent Christian scholars, are not only sound, but essential. And not to be considered lightly is a recent trend to offer in the senior year an orientation course—a course that would

attempt a correlation of all the many facets of knowledge, welding them together and giving purposeful direction to the aggregate. In such a course, "religious orientation" may well become the focal objective of all learning and of all life.

But let us sharpen the objectives and content of such courses in religion and in religious education. It must at once be recognized that in every normal group of students there are those who have already set their sights toward full-time Christian service, (be that the Christian ministry or some other area) and there are those, greater in number, whose lot will be among the laity. The question, therefore, which immediately presents itself in terms of undergraduate courses in religion and religious education, is: "What differentiation in course offerings should be made for these two groups?" Obviously, in this matter we are confronted with different schools of thought. There are those, for instance, who would set up one type of curricula for students who plan to pursue theological and other professional graduate studies in the field of Christian service, and another type of curricula for potential lay workers; and there are good arguments to support such thinking. However, there are vet more basic considerations which should guide us in determining the answer.

Fundamentally, it would seem that meaningful college education should be organized around issues of living rather than around technical requirements of gradaute schools. It would seem that ideally, college education should be "training for life at the next level." Perhaps "students should be required to choose an area in which to develop competency in living," for although "knowledge is necessary, it has value only for the use to which it can be put."

If such should constitute the criterion for determining the exact type and character of the several specific courses to be offered in religion and in religious education, it would seem that the eventual destination of a given student in terms of his ultimate profession or vocation should play a far less pertinent part in differential curricula. To be sure, in the pursuance of such a philosophy, there are very real practical problems to be solved, such as reconciling college courses with hard and fast requirements of some of our present professional schools, but it would

THE BEARING OF RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION

be vastly worthy of experimentation and exploration in this reorientation of college objectives. Further reference to this idea is to be found in Item 4.

(2) Purposeful interpretation of the religious core and of the dynamic in all courses of all departments.

For instance, students in the field of commerce must indeed learn the principles of business and the technique of marketing and the psychology of advertising and the many other technical phases of that vocation. But such is not enough. They must above all else understand and be motivated to put into practice a Christian economic philosophy that comprehends business as a servant to the best interests of all, rather than as a servant to the vested interests of self; a philosophy that puts a premium on cooperation and fair practices rather than on cunningness and shrewdness and ruthless competition.

Moreover, it is not enough that students in the field of science learn merely the laws of nuclear energy or the active elements of chemical compounds or the source and origin of disease germs or even develop the scientific mind. They must above all else understand *how* this knowledge can be used to serve the common good of all, and they must be imbued with the zeal to make their own contribution to such unselfish service.

Such a procedure obviously demands a type of Christian leadership in the persons of the faculty of the institution, who themselves are imbued with this understanding and with a Christian dynamic which becomes contagious. It has been suggested, and perhaps wisely, that some type of syllabi should be developed to show ways and means of providing religious orientation in the various fields. Most professors lack time to work out such material for themselves. Such syllabi, therefore, could serve as resource material for these teachers in their particular areas of work.

(3) The establishment and maintenance on campus and in all campus activities of a Christian atmosphere and a Christian spirit, created by and reflected in the type and content of extracurricular activities.

This is a broad subject, and a somewhat nebulous one in terms of measurement. What is a Christian atmosphere and

how can one know that it exists? Are so-called religious campus organizations, such as the Y.W. and Y.M. the only means of creating such atmosphere and such spirit? The answer for this latter question is obviously "No." Such so-called religious organizations can be very helpful, but if misguided or if operating under weak leadership, can be not only ineffectual, but actually negative; in their influence. The Christian dynamic is not confined, nor should it be, to expressly "religious" campus groups. It seems to me that the principle referred to in Item 2 with reference to a religious interpretation of all formal courses other than specifically religious ones, is equally applicable to extracurricular activities as well. The spirit of cooperation, of harmony, of consideration, of tolerance, and the spirit of many other attributes of Christian living can and must become prominent in all campus relations if a Christian atmosphere and a Christian spirit are to be realistically generated. The measure of attainment of this objective rests again unquestionably with the type and quality of leadership-faculty and student-and not with the mechanics of organization or with the diversity of extracurricular groups. It is, therefore, in this area that leadership education can and must make a singular and significant contribution, for assuming that potential faculty leaders of such activities are genuinely Christian, there is yet real need for helping them to develop the skills and the techniques for making their Christian philosophy operative and contagious in the lives of those whom they attempt to guide. And the same goes for potential student leaders as well. Leadership education at this point is either weak or lacks proper correlation.

Perhaps one of the more important factors in the campus program for the establishment and maintenance of a truly Christian spirit is the chapel service. Some church-related schools have completely abandoned chapel, others are making it optional, and still others make it required. It would seem that ideally, it should not be compulsory, but let it be hastily added that again, ideally, it should be made so stimulating and so inspirational and so compelling that, whether it is required or optional, all students will, of their own free will, choose never to be absent. This is more than we can expect, you say. That fear is indeed warranted

unless the leadership is drastically improved. There is a good case to be made, however, for required chapel as well. And the reasoning here is no different than that for required courses in religion. So long as we place attendance for academic courses on a required basis, it would seem that religious orientation through chapel services ought to receive the selfsame importance and prominence. But here again leadership holds the key, for it is not impossible to conceive that a weak, ultra pietistic, emotional leader may exert more of a negative religious influence than a positive one. It is to be conceived that an athletic monogram club under expert and devout Christian leadership could exert more influence upon a student's religious orientation than a series of chapel services under devout but intelligent guidance. The worth, therefore, of extracurricular activities in terms of religious orientation is not to be determined by type and diversity but by leadership and positive direction.

(4) A conscious and purposeful correlation of college and community life, especially in relation to the program of local churces.

Here we find fertile ground for cultivation. Correlation between college and community life in many instances is next to nil. Many colleges expressly profess to be training students for life, training students to take their places effectively and fully in community, national and world affairs, and yet unconsciously these same institutions become parties to the complete divorcement of student life from community and local church experience. Obviously, the total responsibility for this failure cannot be laid upon the doorstep of the educational institution; many churches themselves must share this responsibility. But whatever the cause, it suffices to say that the need for correlation is desperately urgent.

Again, let it be said that regardless of a student's ultimate vocational or professional goal, college education must embrace training for active participation in the Christian church and direct avenues for such work. Illustrative of the kind of practical courses which "aware" colleges may well consider as offerings are, "How to Teach a Sunday School Class," "Responsibilities of Church

Membership," "Objectives, Techniques and Content in the Religious Education of Children," or "Young People" or "Adults."

After all, the test of the adequacy and efficiency of such college training is to be ascertained by the degree and by the success with which college folk—during and following their graduation are found to be active in church and other religious situations in their home communities. Scientific studies to determine such facts should be profitable and revealing undertakings.

But the college working alone toward such ends can never fully achieve these desirable, ultimate goals. There must be established an ever closer correlation between the plan and program of college and church and professional school if maximum competence is to be realized in the lives of Christian workers, be they lay or professional. There must be found better ways of integrating the resources of these three agencies if improvement and progress are to be assured. And in the process of such correlative development, recruitment for full time Christian service must become a definite, cooperative objective.

III

In summary, may it be said in the words of George Albert Coe that: "Religion, instead of being a department of education is an implicit motive thereof. It is the end that presides over the beginning and gives unity to all stages of the process." What seems to be needed today, therefore, in undergraduate levels, is not a narrow specialization in religion or in religious education, but a broad base made up of the many facets of knowledge bound together and given meaning by the central Christian ethic of life, and thereby inspiring the learner to dedicate his energies and his life to a fervent and active Christian discipleship.

The resultant needs which seem, therefore, to stem from the foregoing philosophy may perhaps be briefly summarized in the following five recommendations:

1. Formal courses in religion and in religious education should be comprehended in a college curricula, but their content should be so planned as to achieve the following objectives:

THE BEARING OF RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION

a. A basic understanding by the learner of the Christian ethic which must permeate all of life.

b. An inspired enthusiasm on the part of the student to make this ethic operative by means of his active participation in the work and life of his church.

c. A practical knowledge of general techniques for such active church membership at his present level and at his next level of development.

2. Renewed studies should be undertaken to ascertain and to experiment with ways and means of relating *all* college courses in all departments to the central Christian motive of life.

3. Colleges should re-examine their campus and off-campus activities with a view of making them efficient laboratories for the inculcation and practice of a personal Christian philosophy and spirit. Such re-examination may also well be promoted by the cooperative undertaking of specific studies in this area.

4. There must be developed by cooperative action of the agencies involved a greater inter-relatedness between the contribution of the college, to professional and graduate schools and to the church and community service of its students and graduates.

5. Although there must be a renewed realization on the part of college administrations of their responsibility for the development of an intelligent recruitment program for full-time Christian service, yet there must be an equal realization on their part that this fact does not impose upon colleges the task of producing specialists in the field of religion but rather, the task of giving to all students, regardless of their ultimate vocational or professional destination, a broad Christian base and a fervent and contagious Christian zeal.

WHAT MAKES A SCHOOL

A school is not made by the title it writes across its public announcements, nor by the propaganda speeches made by its officers. Colleges are not made by what they do to the students, but by what they do for them.

-Charles F. Saunders.

Wanted: Christian Teachers for Christian Colleges

A. LELAND FORREST Dean, Taylor University

AM aware of certain dangers which are encountered if one would write on any subject related to the Christian college. There is first the problem of definition. What is a Christian college? There is the problem of area and scope. What is the rightful field of service for the Christian college? At least, when one writes concerning this type of institution, he is not limited by lack of problem-materials with which to deal.

The concern of this paper is the staffing of Christian colleges with competent personnel. Competency in this instance must mean more than mere proficiency in certain subject-matter areas, as indeed it must when the word is applied to any type of institution of learning. Yet, in a more fundamental sense when the Christian college is considered, competency must mean instructional skill plus the whole ability of the teacher to interpret the ideals, philosophy and heritage of the institution in terms of present day needs. Such a teacher needs the framework of a genuinely Christian institution in which to do his best teaching. Hence, we are thrown back upon a necessity for some definitions of a Christian college? Even though it places me in that company that rushes in where angels fear to tread, I venture a few characteristics of such a college.

I

What is a Christian college? The term has been used very loosely. It has been used to describe almost any independent, non-tax-supported institution. It has been used, certainly, to describe all church-related colleges.

A college may be church-controlled and yet not be a Christian institution. It may have a Bible requirement in its gradua-

[182]

tion pattern, and still foster attitudes and life practices which are hurtful. Christian education is not something added on to a water-tight curriculum. To be a Christian college, I would suggest that at least four criteria should be observed.

of man and nature. I am aware of the problem which the use of the word "spiritual" raises, yet I know of no better word by which to set the contrast between the Christian outlook and that which is entirely materialistic. The Christian interpretation works out from the conviction that behind and beyond all that may be seen, there is a Supreme Mind which men call God. It further believes that observable data indicate that intelligent planning by this Supreme Mind points toward a divine purpose for life. This leads to the conviction that reality is ultimately spiritual, that values and goals are the important considerations in all education and living, and that materials and things are but backdrops for these greater values.

This Christian philosophy, in a genuinely Christian college, cannot but be the concern of one or two departments. It must permeate all the life and relationships of the group. It will set the framework of the teaching-learning experiences, whether in the sciences, in literature, in religion, or in other fields. Such a philosophy will be the unifying force which gives aim and direction to the Christian institution.

2. A Christian college is one in which persons are central. This characteristic is a natural outgrowth of the first. If a Divine Intelligence is the source of all life, then the development of intelligent persons, capable of "thinking God's thoughts after him," is our supreme task. This must be done through providing creative experiences in which persons may explore, may make decisions, may receive directions and insights, and may grow.

3. A Christian college is one in which beliefs eventuate into life. Growing out of its concern for persons is the Christian institution's concern for the kind of persons which it produces. No longer can it depend upon indoctrination in the tenets of a particular church as the distinctive mark of its Christian teaching. Beliefs must not become mere shibboleths to be repeated. Spiritual ideals and beliefs must become concrete in actual living.

Persons produced by Christian schools should not consider the training which they have received simply as a tool by which to gain and hoard material possessions. The product of the Christian college should be a Christian person, with the qualities of character, spiritual insight, social concern and moral awareness which are usually associated with that term.

4. A Christian college is one which provides for Christian freedom. The Apostle Paul gives this thought its best-known expression by his declaration, "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty" (2 Cor. 3:17). With this liberty, however, goes the responsibility of loyalty to Christ as the Norm of our Christian teaching. This places upon the Christian college the responsibility to understand and to interpret the historic Christian teachings in terms of life-needs. Within the framework of this loyalty, there is room for ample freedom and Christian growth on the part of both faculty and student body.

II

It is obvious that such a Christian college is an impossible dream unless it is staffed by a particular type of teacher. What kind of teachers will be needed for a college possessing the abovenamed characteristics?

- I. Certain basic convictions. It is considered by some a sure sign of a closed mind if one speaks of having convictions. However, it would seem that a person who works within the framework of a Christian philosophy of the universe must himself be gripped by that philosophy. He may find himself at variance in point of detail with many others holding a like outlook, so along with his depth of conviction, he will need a breadth of appreciation of those who differ. Christian colleges are in need of teacers who believe some basic Christian interpretations of the nature of man, his need of salvation, his destiny, and the world in which he lives. These beliefs will make a difference in their approach to teaching. Whatever may be the field in which such a teacher works, his underlying philosophy will give wholeness and direction to his teaching.
- 2. Respect for other persons. Lest an over-emphasis of the above point opens the door for a narrow bigotry, the necessity for

a respect for other persons should be emphasized. Christian colleges are in need of teachers who are not primarily interested in making students into carbon copies of themselves. The good teacher does not find his highest joy on finding his pet phrases repeated verbatim on examinations. The best Christian teacher is the one who presents the data of his field, gives the interpretation of the data as best he can with the broadest tools at his command, and then encourages the student to seek his own evaluations. In such an atmosphere, faith in God and faith in people are developed.

3. Capable and well-prepared teachers. The Christian college cannot substitute an ethereal religiosity for adequate intellectual preparation. If the Christian college is to be effective in its work, it must claim the loyalty of persons who are capable teachers, persons who can inspire students with the desire to explore and inquire. This means that it must find and enlist those who not only have the Christian interpretation of life, but who in addition to this quality are intellectually alert, always growing.

4. A sense of calling. D. Elton Trueblood, in The Common Ventures of Life, has emphasized the need of a sense of calling, of full-life service, in every vocation. The Christian college must enlist those persons who teach because of a sense of life-purpose. It might be well for the administrators of the Christian college to face the fact frankly that persons teaching in such institutions, especially small colleges, will do so at great personal sacrifice. The small church-related college cannot compete with many other institutions in its salary schedule. Even so, it might also be well for the administrators of the Christian college to continue to invite the best teachers to join them in an adventure in Christian teaching for only so can the spiritual foundations of our educational system be preserved. The Christian college should not have persons on its staff who could not command greater financial returns elsewhere.

This call for teachers who teach from a sense of calling should not be an excuse for providing less than its best by the college. While it provides the best conditions possible for its staff, the Christian college will yet afford a fertile field for teaching as a service-calling. To the Christian instructor life, with its op-

portunities and abilities, is a God-given trust. Let those teachers who share that conviction find some Christian college in which to give a fruitful and satisfying account of that trust.

III

There are many areas in which the Christian college, especially the small liberal arts college, cannot compete with its public-supported neighbors. It is the better part of wisdom, so it seems, to do well what we can do. Let the Christian college examine its program and procedures with a view to bringing them into harmony with a vigorous Christian philosophy of life. Let us have colleges that are vitally Christian. Then, such a college should follow a program of enlistment which will bring to its staff persons who are in harmony with its philosophy, competent in their fields, and who consider teaching as a Christian life calling. These educational aims in the hands of such teachers will do much to assure that the Christian college will train persons who are equipped to contribute to the life of our day.

WHAT CAN CHRISTIAN EDUCATION DO FOR THE CHURCH?

Take the Church back to the method used by Jesus and the early Christian Church.

Double the Church's membership within the next decade.

Through Conservation reduce the need for Reclamation and multiply a hundred fold the effective outcome of funds and effort devoted to church work.

Vitalize and give dynamic force to the spiritual life of the Church by building religion firmly into the everyday character and experience of people.

Provide for the Church an intelligent and loyal membership instructed in the Bible and trained for Christian living.

Make it possible for the Church to take the offensive for the spiritual regeneration of the world.

-George Herbert Betts.

All Things Are Possible

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

In LINE with the modern mood for cryptic things, we might call this C Day for you. It is Commencement Day. It is so aptly named. Life is a series of Commencements, early and late. One graduates to new spheres, new hopes, new aspirations and new responsibilities until at long last comes the Grand Commencement of the life immortal.

For a time, there may be other formal schooling and training for all or some of you. But at last, you come to grips with this great moral adventure called life.

I know of no better bench mark from which to start than the day whose anniversary was so quietly and unostentatiously observed only two days ago. It was the fifth anniversary of D-Day. It was the day for the opening of the second front. That day saw a massing of resources—men, machines and munitions—under carefully calculated conditions to establish a beachhead that would fan out to ultimate victory. And it did. Less than a year after D-Day came VE Day. Three months after VE Day came VJ Day.

The tyrants had been disposed. Whether tyranny and other concepts for the enslavement of people had been disposed was quite another matter.

The ordeal of bloodletting came to an end. But it did not mark the end of conflict. The struggle had shifted from the military to the diplomatic battlefield where it presently lodges. The headlines of each day are rather eloquent on that point. We were prepared now to return to serene living, to translate our idealism into a code of human and international conduct.

In this brave new post-war world, people seem to be pretty much the same as they were in the pre-war world. There was a tendency to believe that for some unaccountable reason, they would be different; that the very enormity of World War II would have

The Hon. Everett M. Dirksen, of Pekin, Ill., has been a member of Congress for eight years. This article is a condensation of his Commencement address delivered at the 1949 graduation exercises of Hope College.

a strangely sobering effect; that the very awfulness of atomic destruction would chasten the spirit; that a singularly activated conscience would work some strange alchemy on the minds and hearts of people. But somehow, they appear to be pretty much the same as in all other generations. Today as before, one finds the same hates and loves, the same emotions and passions, the same grace and sweetness, the same unselfishness, the same fears and hopes. But over and above the normal impulses which have marked the course of mankind, one finds outwardly at least a greater emphasis on material security. In this respect there is a departure from the assuring sense of metaphysical security entertained by the Pilgrim Fathers and those other rugged souls who pioneered this nation and made possible the social inheritance which we enjoy today.

When one listens for the voice of timidity, he might easily reach the conclusion that this brave new world also has a morbid cast about it. One can find corporals of disaster and sergeants of despair on most any corner. In the same breath, there are people who prattle about freedom from fear and then devise new devils of which to be afraid. There is talk of freedom from want and the next moment one can hear the plaintive cry of fear of abundance and how the very prodigality of the Creator may yet be our undoing.

In many places—and in high places too—one can hear the plaintive cry of frustration in the land. So many expected so much. Truly, they expected a brave new world, a different world, a utopian world. They had visions of every passion stilled in the human breast. They saw swords beaten into ploughshares and spears into pruning hooks. They saw a quick triumph of justice over injustice. They saw wholly unselfish men of vision around the Council tables, adjusting the differences of men and nations without resort to force. The headlines of each day seem to have reduced the vision to cold ashes. Force still stalks the world.

They are like the soldiers in Bellevue Hospital. When Dr. Sizoo, noted preacher in the nation's capital went there on Saturday afternoons to give counsel to young men who had been so mangled by the instruments of modern warfare, one soldier from

ALL THINGS ARE POSSIBLE

Saipan with one arm gone, the other in a sling, and a Jap sniper's bullet in his spine, suddenly interrupted the discourse with a half agonized cry when he said, "Padre, will anything come of it."

That young man was scanning today's horizons and thinking of what had gone before. Through his memory raced a cavalcade of impressions. They were of millions in uniform, setting forth to stem tyranny's tide; of war machines designed to hasten victory; of millions of the living yielding plasma that the wounded might live; of heartache, agony, dislocation and debt; of a smoking bitter world; of the futile efforts of men around polished tables haggling over the prostrate form of peace. And out of it all came that challenging question, "Padre, will anything come of it."

He was simply phrasing the frustration of others who are nerve-shocked by the tensions and irritations of today. But that is scarcely a defensible attitude in a brave new world. A vehicle has at least been fashioned, sanctioned by all nations, to develop a kind of collective security in the world and while progress has been painfully slow, there has been some progress.

In this brave new world, is there anything especially brave about the attitude of those in the graduating classes of 1949 as expressed in the recent poll by the staff of Fortune Magazine? It points out that some 1200 colleges and universities will graduate about 150,000 men and women in the class of 1949. The average age is about 24. About 70 per cent are veterans and about 30 per cent are married. It characterizes the class of 1949 as the "soberest, most trained graduating class in U. S. history" and then evaluates its attitudes.

Assuming that the responses are real rather than a bit of modern mental jive, they are both puzzling and challenging. The accent is on material security. The class of '49 would appear to be interesting in avoiding chances and betting on a sure thing. The dominant idea seems to be to accept no risk. They hope to find life's adventure in the caverns of business—and big business at that—with a solid salary floor and not too far away from a comfortable home, equipped with a couple of motorcars.

If the survey is correct, the '49-ers do not believe that the world belongs to risk, or if it does, they are not interested. The

ulcer as the indicator of today's tempo has no fascination for them. The accent is on security. Like the one-talent man, they would appear to retrieve it from the earth, without the hazard of multiplying it and simply say, "Here thou hast what is thine."

If this be true, shall one conclude that 51-guage nylon, convertibles, indoor plumbing, hot and cold running water, paved streets, condensed milk, vitamins, Pyramids of Friendship, Sing it again, and television have finally gotten at the core of American life? I do not say so. I am asking.

What was it but willingness to risk that sent the Mayflower across uncharted seas, staffed with men and women, who against countless hazards, laid the keel of a free life which is our richest social inheritance? Willingness to risk impelled R. E. Olds to establish the first exclusive motorcar plant on East Jefferson Street in Detroit and lay the foundation for an industrial empire of which this state is rightly proud.

Willingness to risk impelled Lindbergh to gamble his all that one motor would not stop, sleep would not overwhelm him, and that the Atlantic could be crossed by plane. Willingness to risk sent Byrd to Little America to gather data which will be useful to his country for a long time to come.

Willingness to risk caused two young men—only 27 years of age—Edward Rutledge of South Carolina and Thomas Lynch from the same state to affix their names to the Declaration of Independence and so pledge their lives and fortunes to freedom against the most powerful monarch of that day.

Shall it be said that the Forty-niners in this century, unlike the Forty-niners of another century prefer a moral sit-down rather than go west, beckoned on by the spirit of risk? Is this the mood of the age, and if so, what accounting do we the beneficiaries of the risk-takers of an earlier day, make to the generations who shall come after? And is this the spirit by which history shall characterize the brave new world of today?

Surely there is a message for times like these. Surely, there is a moral and spiritual approach to the material hobgoblins of today, whether they be real or fancied. First, let it be said that there is no retreat from what is here. Whether as individuals or as na-

ALL THINGS ARE POSSIBLE

tions, we are not only in this world but of it. There may be some allure about the very thought of retreating to some moral island and living alone. It cannot be done for long nor successfully. Isolation is an outworn credo in an integrated world. The simplest law of Nature is to vegetate or decay. That is equally true of human progress.

What then is a message for such a fretful period? It was set down by a young man named Mark. It came immediately after the Transfiguration. Jesus was in a crowd, including the scribes. Out of the crowd a common man stood forth to ask for the healing of his son who had a dumb spirit. Since this son foamed, it is reasonable to conclude that he was probably an epileptic. It was to this common, obscure man that the Great Physician said, "If Thou canst believe, all things are possible to him that believeth."

There it is in one small package, shining down from the parchments of long ago. "If Thou canst believe, all things are possible to him that believeth." There are two pronouns in that sentence. Observe the first one. If "Thou" canst believe. That means you. That's a very personal exhortation. It doesn't come cheaper by the dozen. This is a personal matter and it does not come wholesale. All things are possible to him. Again the personal note is emphasized.

Such a code of belief is the answer to every force that would deter or divert you from those objectives. Belief is the answer to the frustrations of today for what is frustration but disillusionment born of doubt. Belief is the answer to futility for what is futility but weakness born of doubt. Belief is the answer to morbid gloom, for what is this gloom but doubt about the future. It is the product of looking in the wrong direction. It is the fruit of thinking that has no sound and rooted tradition behind it. Could Joshua, executive assistant to Moses, have heeded the admonition of the Lord to be strong, of good courage, unafraid and undismayed in carrying out his responsibilities if he had lacked faith in himself, and in the ends and purposes of life?

Often I've thought back to that early morning in 1941 when a blinding flash in the heavens beyond Almagordo, New Mexico, announced to the watchers and to the world that thte physical

atom had been fractured and its nuclear lightning subjected to man's direction for good or evil.

That same atom whose heart lies revealed to men has been here a long time. It was here in the days when civilization was cradled along the Tigris and Euphrates. It was here in the days of Joshua and Jeremiah. It was here in the days of Paul and Timothy. It was here in the days of Augustus and Scipio. It was here in the days of Napoleon and Lincoln. It was always here and always the same. It was only that physicists conceived it as a miniature billiard ball which lay at the heart of matter. It remained for men impelled by the stress of an emergency to lay bare the force that was to destroy hundreds of thousands of lives at Nagasaki and Hiroshima.

It is so difficult to believe that there is another kind of atom, call it moral, spiritual or ethical, which can be fractured and forced loose to raze every barrier which stands in the way of a far better, braver world than the one in which we live.

Before he died, Charles Steinmetz, wizard that he was in the field of things electrical, said that the great discoveries of the next fifty years will be in the spiritual field. But discoveries are made only by those who accept risk and by those who believe. Truly all things are possible to him that believeth, to him that believeth in God!

The Christian Observer of Louisville, Kentucky, quotes the following from The Romance of Evangelism by Dr. Rowland Q. Leavell:

"5% of reported church members do not exist;; 10% cannot be found; 20% never pray; 25% never read the Bible; 30% never attend church services; 40% never give to any cause; 50% never go to Sunday School; 60% never go to church on Sunday evening; 70% never give to missions; 75% never have family worship, and 95% never win a soul to Christ."

"Tell me of your educational hardships."

"Well, I lived seven blocks from the Carnegie library, but we had no automobile."

[192]

An Experiment in Christian Living The Federation Chalet

MARIE-JEANNE DE HALLER AND KEITH R. BRIDSTON

W HEN the first Federation Chalet opened its doors at Easter 1945, who would have thought that this was but the first step towards an ongoing enterprise which, in spite of all financial uncertainty, we feel at all costs must carry on?

Early 1945 was still wartime. Large numbers of refugee students were allowed to study in Geneva thanks to W.S.R., but the regulations of the country obliged them to go back to refugee camps in Switzerland during the holidays. This was very bad for a few of them whose health had been seriously shaken by what they had been through, and who could not stand the primitive life anl sometimes hard work in the camps. The Federation office was then the place where students in distress from all possible nationalities and creeds came to look for comfort, spiritual as well as material. Deeply moved by the cases of some of these wartime visitors we decided to find a way of offering them a shelter, or better a home, for the Easter holidays, where they could find refreshment for body and soul. A tiny chalet up in the mountains was put up at our disposal, and we could welcome there a small family of thirty students, in three successive groups of ten. Greeks, Poles, Hungarians, French, Ukrainians, Italians, and others could at least spend two weeks without worrying about their next meal.

THE POWER OF CHRIST IN A COMMUNITY

But a still more important fact was that these students were ceasing to be mere units in the crowd of needy students, and for many it was the first time that they encountered again real friendship, and found themselves in an atmosphere of confidence with people really caring for them personally. After the anonymous life of the camps and the hatred caused by war, it took them some time to realize that this was true. Several of them, non-Chris-

tians, were so startled by it that they joined us at prayers morning and evening, and we could have many serious talks about the Christian faith. They were so intrigued by the authenticity of such a faith, which was translated in daily life through a love overcoming all human barriers, that this was for a few of them the first step towards commitment to Jesus Christ. Never have I been more startled by the power of the Christian witness in small things as when I saw what was happening among these students. A few weeks, and sometimes even a few days, spent in a true Christian community (and God knows that we were still a poor family of sinners!) can really draw a man back from the brink of despair, even if his future is wholly dark, because there he meets the living power of Christ and His love which is greater than the madness and the cruelty of this world.

After such an experiment we could not stop. We had to hire a larger house for the three months of the summer vacation. We knew too many students for whom such an opportunity was essential. The main point was to keep the "family" character although the students would be more numerous. Sixteen members of the same family with quite different backgrounds and convictions, speaking different languages, nervously shaken when not actually in despair, do not form an easy group to hold happily together! Nevertheless, the enterprise proved again an unbelievable success. The strong nucleus of Christians was the backbone of the life of the Chalet, and the contribution of a few S.C.M. leaders from abroad (the war was now over and travel from country to country, though still difficult, was no longer impossible) proved invaluable. But it would be difficult to state who received more from the Chalet, its leaders or its guests! The miracle of the first occasion took place again, Christianity became something real and living for students who had never paid much attention to it. For others it meant a serious deepening of their faith through the daily challenge of physical and moral suffering.

Discovering the Federation

During the next months circumstances changed rapidly. With the summer of 1946 the need of refugee students was no longer so acute, many of them had already left for other countries. But S.C.M. leaders all around Europe were coming closer to the point of breakdown, now that the tension of war and occupation was over. The Chalet became then a rest and recuperation centre for such leaders, thirsting for contracts abroad, exchange of experiences, new inspiration and ideas for their work. It was now not only Europe that was represented. The W.S.C.F. General Committee and Summer Conference brought over delegates from other parts of the world which made the Federation become a really living thing for the inhabitants of the Chalet. Worship and Bible study, discussion groups and the peeling of potatoes, hikes and socials, all these elements of a very elastic programme brought people together who had thought they would never be able to meet again. "I have discovered the Federation at the Chalet . . . The Chalet is the best thing the W.S.C.F. has ever done." How many such sentences have we read and heard! 1947 and 1948 were just a repetition of such an experiment.

Of course this experiment in Christian living has never paid for itself. Sheer poverty and insurmountable currency problems have reduced the paying guests to a small proportion of the whole, though it is encouraging the way in which students and leaders have paid what they could, and as they could. The Chalet, however, has always been a main item in that section of our Federation Reconstruction budget, which we have called rehabilitation of individuals. And here we would pay eager tribute to the gifts which have come to us from churches through *Church World Service* in America, and *Christian Reconstruction in Europe* in London, and from a variety of friends and student groups, particularly Methodist students in America.

The wardens are very much the key people in a Chalet, if they know how to create a family out of a very mixed group of twenty-five to thirty people. Indeed the successive Chalets would never have been what they were, had we not had a series of firstclass leaders. In their diversity they all carried out their delicate task so well, because they understood it as an expression of Christian love, which is concerned both with the bodies and souls of those we meet.

Here is what Keith and Elizabeth Bridston, who came to us from the Lutheran Student Association of America via the Brit-

ish Student Christian Movement, and were the wardens in 1948, have to say to us.

AN AMAZING SUMMER

Two of the strongest memories which I carry away from the Chalet relate to the very beginning and the very end of the season respectively. The first is the feeling of both hesitation and anticipation which we felt as the train slowly moved up the valley and we caught our first glimpse over the trees of the "Hotel des Marécottes:" what was to lie ahead for us in the next few months and how would everything work out? The second memory is of the very last night before leaving when we rested for a moment along the road from Salvan, after a fondue party for the staff, and watched the immense moon bathing everything in a quiet white light; now it was all over and we were so filled with the thousands of details of the summer that we could hardly draw our impressions together—we had the feeling of both intense regret and of great satisfaction. But how short had been the time between the two events; the whole summer had rushed by in a way we had never experienced before and yet it was a time we had a greater variety and number of different things happening within a short period than we could remember.

How clearly we see our very first "guest," standing at the door-way and asking if this were the Federation Chalet: Did you have a good trip? What is your name? Where is your home? How we wondered if we were saying the right things and doing the right things! But before long the house began to fill and we had moved from one table-full to two and then to three. How difficult is was to take the first people to the station to say good-bye! The circle had been completed. We also think of the little group on the front lawn scrubbing away at the potatoes in the morning, their mouths moving as fast as their brushes and knives. The "Chalet-language" was always a source of amusement too: "We really need ropes and pickles to climb this mountain!" Someone said that it was a wonderful language because in any sentence someone could find a word or two of their own language which they could understand!

An Experiment in Christian Living

There were also tense moments too, when the hikers came in late for dinner and put the kitchen-schedule off, or when we got caught in the rain climbing up to Barberine through the snow and then had to dry off in a little smoke-filled room in the primitive lake-side restaurant. Finally, we resorted to the "cuckoosong" which both revived our spirits and also got our circulation moving by its gymnastics. The theoretical discussions were not limited to the house either. Seeing a German theological professor sitting in a blueberry patch surrounded by a Syrian, a French girl, a Dutchman, an American, and an Italian-their collecting tins neglected-vigorously discussing the various New Testament interpretations of the word "faith" was a real pedagogical experience! Or standing in the rain waiting for a new arrival on the train and singing "She'll Be Coming Around the Mountain When She Comes . . . Toot, Toot!" was something of a revelation for the villagers too, until they became familiar with the antics of the student-family.

OUR DIFFERENCES AND OUR UNITY

The difficulties of understanding one another went far deeper than mere language barriers. How different we think, and act and are, indeed! This summer has impressed us with the radical differences that separate us. What does an American from a wealthy New York family, sheltered, cultured, untouched by suffering, disease and famine really have in common with a German student, recently escaped from a P.O.W. camp in Russia, who is broken by disease and suffering, twisted in mind, spirit and body by the awfulness of his experiences? How can they really understand one another? I do not think that they can in any real way; the differences which separate them are as deep and real as those which separate a man of the twentieth century from one of the tenth century—they are not the same differences, but they are just as real. And then we try to overcome these differences with easy talk about Christian "forgiveness" or sentimental feelings about "international fellowship and friendship." Of course, these are important but they are not enough. Or to take another example, what does a Y.M.C.A. worker in Moslem Egypt have in common with a Scandinavian Lutheran who comes from a coun-

try with a nominal 98% church membership? Or how is a medical student from the Gold Coast a brother to a medical student in a Displaced Persons camp in Germany? No, I cannot believe that good-will and good intentions, however well meant, are enough; musical choirs, or the cuckoo song, or picnic lunches are not enough, and never will be enough.

A radical disease demands a radical remedy. It was when each morning and each evening as we knelt before God, each confessing his sins and asking God's mercy and love, that we really became one. It was when we studied God's Word together and it spoke to both of us and asserted its dominion over both of us that we were really one. That is what the Chalet has meant to us: it has meant that we discovered our differences as never before and that was sad and painful. But we also discovered our unity: a unity which is not ours, but which is pressed upon us because we have become fellow-slaves of God, fellow-children of God, fellow-sinners and fellow-saints, joint-heirs with Christ of the glories of the Kingdom of God: "For as in one body we have many members . . . so we, though many, are one body in Christ, and individually members one of another. Having gifts that differ according to the grace given to us, let us use them."

PHYSICAL AND SPIRITUAL RECONSTRUCTION

It was therefore true that the Chalet performed several different services. Some of them have already been mentioned, for instance, giving people the usual Federation experience of living in an international student community and doing so more effectively I suppose than most conferences. Another thing which it did was to provide an opportunity for students who have been living under extremely trying conditions, especially from Germany, but not exclusively, to get the desperately needed rest, good food and change of environment. Time and again we would watch the amazing change that could so easily be seen in one or two weeks; a person who arrived sickly pale, self-conscious, and tired and weakly, would almost overnight start getting colour in his cheeks, begin laughing and singing at the table, and take enormous hikes without a second thought. It really was an incredible process which can hardly be believed unless it is seen. The work of the

AN EXPERIMENT IN CHRISTIAN LIVING

Chalet in physical and mental "reconstruction" was, then, a real success.

But it also seems to me equally clear that it was a success along those lines because it was a Christian Chalet-a Christian "family." The food was not so wonderful, nor was the environment sufficiently magical, to account for the change that could be seen in student after student. These helped, of course, but I think the fact that they came in the context of a Christian community is the most important thing. The strange thing to me was that those folk who seemed to need the physical help the most were often those who were most keen for discussions and Bible study and who seemed to get the most out of the worship services. Some of them said that they did not come just to get a good meal or two and a pleasant room to sleep in; they wanted and expected the opportunities for Bible study, common worship, and general discussions with fellow Christian students. It is clear to me from our experience this summer that, though the programme and life of the Chalet must be as free and flexible as possible to give people adequate chance for rest and physical and mental restoration, there must also be time for spiritual nurture on a more formal level through the organized meetings and worship. It is only then that the Chalet is doing a work which entitles it to be called "Federation work."

Reprinted from "The Student World," First Quarter 1949.

WHAT EDUCATION DOES

"Education does not mean teaching people what they do not know. It means teaching them to behave as they do not behave. It is not teaching the youth the shapes of the letters and the tricks of numbers, and then leaving them to turn their arithmetic to roguery, and their literature to lust. It means, on the contrary, training them into the perfect exercise and the kingly continence of their bodies and souls. It is painful, continual and difficult work to be done by kindness, by watching, by warning, by precept and by praise, but above all—by example.

-John Ruskin.

Who Is Christianizing Our Children?

GEORGE ZUIDEMA

One of the most prominent aspects of modern life is the tendency towards secularism. In this sort of civilization we witness the gradual divorce of Christianity from daily living. Such fields as politics, business and industry believe themselves to be self-sufficient, although religion is still accorded a certain amount of traditional respect.

Secularization of education has been carried to an unfortunate extreme, for it was not intended to devaluate religious faith. Yet this is the exact effect which has been produced. It may help to explain the disturbed conditions of our time that we now have a large modern generation of people grown to maturity without adequate education in religion and with a seriously impaired interest in it.

For some centuries this tendency toward secularization has been making itself felt. Medieval Europe had a framework of spiritual unity which is conspicuously lacking in our western industrial world. Economic, political and social groups began by asserting their independence from religion, and their own self-sufficiency. Thus secularism began, not as a denial of religion, but as a denial of its relevance to daily living. This isolation of religion from practical affairs seriously impaired its potency as a moral force.

Even in our own country, religious and secular education have not always existed separately. On the contrary the Church is often spoken of as the mother of the school, and the first educational programs in America were formulated in Puritan New England. Here religious unity made it expedient for a system of public-controlled education which placed the proper emphasis upon religion in education.

Mr. Zuidema graduated last June from Hope College, Holland. Michigan, and entered Medical School this September.

WHO IS CHRISTIANIZING OUR CHILDREN?

The adoption of the Constitution of the United States popularized the implied principle of the separation of church and state. This added further impetus to the movement to expel the religious elements from all civil life. The removal of religion from the schools was practically completed by 1850. The warm, wholesome relationship which once existed between the church and schools has been largely replaced by indifferent, and in some cases even antagonistic, attitudes.

An important reason for the exclusion of religious education from public schools was the teaching of sectarian religion. Horace Mann, who was Secretary of the Massachusetts State Board of Education from 1837 to 1848, hoped that a body of commonly accepted religious beliefs might be taught in the schools.

However, not even this hope was realized.

While sectarian teaching in the schools is definitely not desirable, the leaving of religious education entirely to the church and home is poor educational policy. In fact, it is in flat contradiction of the educational tendency which promotes widening of the scope of education. In our present condition we see the school emphasizing and perpetuating a split or dualism in our culture. This, incidentally, represents a repudiation of the philosophy of education which is stated well in the recent report of the President's Commission: "The first goal in education for democracy is the full-rounded and continuing development of the person."

Just as education moved from the home to the classroom, religious teaching in far too many instances has also left the home and school to become the responsibility of the church alone. It is needless to say that in many cases religious instruction was, and is, entirely inadequate.

The split between church and state was greatly intensified by the United States Supreme Court decision in the McCollum v. Illinois case, decided March 8, 1948. This case arose when the legality of the Champaign, Illinois plan of release time was challenged. Under this plan, religious teachers employed by the Champaign Council on Religious Education used the public school

¹Higher Education for American Democracy. Vol. 1, Page 9. "Establishing The Goals." A report of the President's Commission on Higher Education. December 1947.

buildings for one period a week to give instruction in religion. For this period of religious instruction, pupils were grouped in classes according to their faith (Protestant, Catholic or Jewish) as indicated by their parents on cards distributed by the school authorities. The cards were supplied by the Council on Religious Education. Children who did not attend religious classes were sent to study halls, or were otherwise occupied with regular school work.

Under the Supreme Court's decision it is unconstitutional:2

- "I. To use tax-supported public school buildings for the dissemination of religious doctrines.
- 2. To aid religious groups to spread their faith by releasing pupils from their legal duty of attending school upon the condition that they attend religious classes.
- For public school authorities to work in close cooperation with religious leaders in promoting religious education.
- 4. To use the State's compulsory school attendance system to assist or promote religious instruction."

The Supreme Court's decision in the McCollum case rests not only upon the fact that the Champaign school buildings were used for religious education, but also upon the school board's cooperation in the program and the fact that compulsory attendance was used to help sectarian instruction." In the light of this decision any plan for released time religious instruction which provides for classes conducted in or outside of public school buildings, under which public school pupils are excused during the secular school day, thereby requiring the cooperation of the school and church authorities, is in violation of the Federal Constitution." The decision does not affect religious instruction classes held away from public school property and outside the hours of the public school day.

An interpretation of this Supreme Court decision by the Michigan Department of Public Instruction presents a less bleak

²Michigan Department of Public Instruction. "Memorandum on Religion in the Public Schools." April 23, 1948.

[°]ioia.

⁴ibid.

outlook. "Apparently the spirit behind this decision was to prevent sectarianism in any discussion of the Bible in the public schools. Decisions relating to whether prayer is to be offered and the Bible read in public school assembly programs lie within the discretion of the local board of education."

While this interpretation apparently tempers the harshness of the United States Supreme Court decision, nevertheless it remains as a body blow to Christian education for the "release time" programs had proved their value as highly effective agencies for religious education.

We see about us the evidences of moral degeneration; and coupled with it the slipping of our program of religious education. It is not difficult to see that the responsibility for spiritual growth in our children is coming to lie almost entirely upon the home and church. Recognition of this trend is imperative if parents are to live up to their obligations. The time has come for us to look hard and intently at our religious education system, to re-examine its functional units and revitalize its program. We must, if we expect to keep pace with the rapidly changing world of today, streamline its action and gear it to highest efficiency. Let us ask ourselves "Who is Christianizing our Children?" Let parents and children working together, do something about setting up a program of religious education that answers the need.

With the separation of religious and secular educational programs, we are brought to the realization that religious education rests upon a distinct philosophy. It is necessary therefore to understand its main tenets to have a clear comprehension of the situation. First of all, it accepts the Bible as the primary source of the philosophy of education, of the materials, and of the power to achieve results. Furthermore, the student has a soul as well as a body, and the processes of growth depend upon spiritual factors in addition to those which are distinctly mental and physical. True growth is in wisdom, stature, and favor with God and man.

The functional units or agencies of religious education are now the home and the church. The primary objectives which these agencies seek to further are: development of faith, Christian character and life, and preparation for the eternal continuance of life.

Having thus stated the general agencies and their aims in furthering religious education, let us move in for a closer look at their operation. The home and the church school are designed to work in close harmony in the lower educational levels to provide firm foundations in the fundamental concepts of our faith. It is sad to relate that a modern attitude in the home of indifference to anything connected with religion is seriously impairing this enterprise. It is all too evident that modern man is simply too busy to be bothered. Despite the need for establishing the youth in the Christian way, we are forced to admit the presence of several glaring deficiencies in the organization of our Sunday Schools.5, 6 and our homes as well. Lack of leaders, funds, materials and cooperation are a few of the handicaps which we are forced to work under. This situation should present a ringing challenge to sincere lay-workers and church leaders alike.

In the realm of higher education, the church college and the Seminary play the prominent roles.7 Considering first the purpose of the church college, we find that the training of well rounded Christian personalities in most church-related colleges take three directions:

- 1. The basic education of young men who have the Christian ministry in view. (pre-theological education)
- 2. The education of full-time lay workers in the church such as missionaries, teachers and ministers of music.
- 3. The preliminary or complete education of young men and women who are planning to enter the professions or other positions of leadership in society. This latter group represents by far the largest portion of students.

An obvious point in the discussion of Christian education is that it is an absolute necessity if our churches are to remain in op-The courses which are necessary for pre-ministerial students are available nowhere but in a church-affiliated school. If these courses were not readily obtainable, progress in the church

⁵The Real Thing in Religious Education by Margueritte Harmon Bro. The Christian Century. February 27, 1935.

⁶Religious Education-A Job for Parents by Wesner Fallow. p. 250.

Religion in Life. Spring Issue—1941.

**Christian Education—Vol. 31 No. 2—June 1948. "Design for Christian Higher Education Today"—by W. P. Hieronymus.

would of course be paralyzed. Also, we must remember the large number of students who have made the decision to enter the ministry during the course of their college careers. The profound Christian influence on the campus has in many cases directed young men and women into Christian service.

Church-related colleges differ from their secular counterparts in that they present Christianity, not merely as another department of instruction, but as the central motivating power whose function is to illuminate, penetrate, direct and evaluate all of the instruction, and all of the life and activities of the college, curricular and extra-curricular. It is for this reason that our program of general and liberal education must include carefully selected and vital courses on the Bible and on other phases of the Christian religion in life. True education is a unified process to equip the individual with such qualities of mind and heart as will enable him to build a meaningful life as well as make a living. Life is a unity which cannot be atomized or divided into segments. Our colleges must, therefore, lead the student to "look at life steadily and to see it whole."

Even the graduates of such a program, who do not go into full-time Christian service, are led to be Christian examples in business and professional circles. In this connection a report to the President of the United States released late in 1947 by the President's Scientific Research Board reveals some extremely interesting facts about higher education. The report stresses the collegiate origin of candidates for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in science.⁸ "Although some ninety universities grant all the doctor's degrees in science, . . . less than half of the candidates received their undergraduate training in the same school that confers their advanced degree. The remaining complete their undergraduate work in about 600 other colleges or universities."

These words assume significance when we study a table prepared to illustrate the standings of all the nation's schools on a basis of Ph.D. degrees received per thousand students for the period 1936-1945. Many of the smaller institutions have, in this period, contributed scientists out of all proportion to the number of their students.

It further revealed that of the ten⁹ schools leading in Ph.D. degrees per thousand students, five of them had definite church affiliation and two others had some connection with religious organizations. Two were strictly technical schools and one a State university. These figures speak extremely well for the quality of education received in church-related schools. This also shows very graphically that the Christian educated young people who are active in higher education and professions are in a position to be powerful examples as leaders in their chosen fields.

Our seminaries might be described as "finishing schools." It is here that the education of our Christian leaders is completed and polished. The teachers and church leaders of the future spring from this well of Christian faith. It is to this source that the entire denomination looks for leadership and even life. It is evident that a healthy seminary is a necessity for a healthy church.

Christian education is the backbone of the Church's missionary enterprise for we should ask—"Who is Christianizing my neighbor's children?" In this respect especially the superiority of the Christian philosophy of life mainfests itself. Where Socrates said, "Know thyself," and Cicero said "Control theyself," Christ said, "Give thyself." It is on this principle that missions are based, and we might add that in this point of view lies the difference which sets Christianity above and apart from other philosophies.

Devoted young people who realize the crying, desperate need for mission workers turn to Christian education in preparation for their careers of unselfish service, and then serve by practicing Christian education wherever the need arises.

It is on the mission fields that we find Christian workers rising above the barriers of denominations to work together in a common effort. There are many lessons on progress and Christian living to be learned from the examples offered us by the lives of mission workers.

The chief end and aim of an educational system is to furnish individuals with the ability to cope with the many complex and difficult aspects of life. Psychologists tell us that the happy and

^{*}loc. cit.: see Note I.

⁹Encyclopedia of American Colleges and Universities.

successfully integrated individual divides his interest among four main categories. The proper emphasis placed upon each leads almost invariably to a well-balanced, successful life. Failure to attend to these four basic interests to disorganization and dissatisfaction.

The four categories which are essential to balanced living are: work, play, worship and love. Too often our programs are concentrated entirely on preparation for a life work. Although this is definitely of utmost importance, we must not err in considering it an end in itself. Likewise in far too many cases play and love are over-emphasized. At any rate, it is the aspect of religion or worship which most often suffers from complete neglect. To the thinking individual it then becomes obvious that many of our educational programs fail at their source by neglecting to emphasize balanced living.

The psychologists who state that a balanced life is necessary for happy and successful living, are merely presenting scientific basis and proof of a fact which the far-seeing founders of Christian education had realized and accepted long ago. Knowing that schools with no church affiliation would certainly ignore spiritual life, their answer to the problem was the founding of several schools, closely allied to the church, to foster and nurture Christian doctrines as a definite part of the curriculum.

The far reaching results of this program are evident. Each year an increasing number of young people, educated in a Christian atmosphere are taking their places in the world with confidence and hope.

The exponents of Christian education of course do not offer it as the sole key to happy and successful living, but they do maintain that they are better qualified to aid young men and women in making their lives wholesome and useful, than many crowded universities which are becoming little better than tremendous machines which coldly and impersonally graduate vast numbers of individuals who have accumulated a specified store of knowledge or specialization.

Education is carried out in the formative years when youth is most impressionable. In a democracy such as ours which demands thinking citizens, it is imperative that youth attains the intelligent and moral outlook which will give him the proper perspective of life. The truth of Proverbs 22:6—"Train up a child in the way he shall go; and when he is old he will not depart from it." has been proven time and time again.

The church affiliated schools feel most strongly the responsibility which is theirs to produce thinking and morally responsible citizens. We can readily understand why the non-Christian Universities have such active communist-front organizations. There is no place for such radical elements in the Church or in Church-supported schools. This is one reason why communism is so bitterly opposed to the Church and Christian education. We at Hope College are brought to the sharp realization of this as we witness the bitter struggle for survival of our adopted sister-college, Saraspatok, in the heart of Communist-dominated Hungary.

There are people, even within the Christian family, who are not interested enough to ask "Who is Christianizing our children?" To these we must explain why Christian education and Christian

character is important.

Those of us who firmly believe in the eternal worth of our dynamic and powerful principles agree that it is the role of Christian education to provide the much-needed motivation to the good life in the true fear and love of God. Life is a constant, unceasing process of character formation. Human events make up an emery cloth which smoothes and polishes the corners from our rough-hewn characters to mold each of us into individual and separate personalities. Our everyday contacts, our interests and our dislikes all operate in determining not only what we are, but what we are to be. In Christian education we have a tool which is invaluable for directing human lives into channels which will bring true happiness and satisfaction.

Religious education is the best character education because the best type of character we know is Christian character. It is the establishment in the mind of the principles and ideals of Jesus Christ so definitely that they modify one's every thought, emotion, word, act and relationship. Such character is realized only through continued training in the Christian religion. It is achieved in the individual and then manifests itself in all phases of his life. It is the most promising plan yet offered for the building and maintenance of a new political, economic and social order in our world. It is the only effective antidote, or still better, preventive, for war.

These points have clearly shown that today's Church stands at the crossroads. The Christian Church will stand or fall according to the policy it maintains toward educating its youth in its fundamental Christian precepts. If the Church is to go forward it must of necessity adopt an aggressive attitude. The time for complacency lies somewhere behind us.

An excellent statement of one denomination's policy is found in "Ten Aims in Christian Education." This paper, prepared in 1947, outlines a broad yet inclusive program for a revitalized expansion. Several of these points are already showing progress. A brief statement of these aims includes:

- "I. An adequate supply of ministerial and missionary candidates through our Christian Colleges and Theological Seminaries.
 - Not less than a ten per cent increase in Sunday School and Church School enrollment, together with more vital and systematic courses of instruction in these schools.
 - A revival of catechetical instruction according to the manner prescribed.
 - 4. New emphasis on Leadership Training through classes in the local church.
 - 5. Every young person in the Church in some active organization other than the Sunday School.
 - 6. A men's organization in every Church and a strong Union in every Classis or geographical area.
 - Formation of adequate courses for the training of lay leadership such as pastor's assistants, directors of Christian Education in the local Church, Church secretaries, etc.
 - 8. The use of the Department of Publication by the local Church for all supplies for the Church, including literature for the whole teaching program of the congregation.
 - Earnest and consistent financial support of the work of Christian Education through the Board, including col-

¹⁰Ten Aims in Christian Education. 1947. April 14, 1947. Published by the Reformed Church in America.

leges and seminaries, religious and missionary education, aid for students in training for ministerial and medical missionary service, young people's work, men's work, and lay leadership training.

 Prayerful assumption by every Church of General Synod's United Advance, including evangelism, Christian Education, Home and Foreign Missions, relief and rebuilding.

After this splendid statement of aims in Christian Education it must become obvious that a large part of the answer to our question—"Who is Christianizing our Children?"—lies purely and simply with ourselves. The time has come for us to become interested in our children's spiritual welfare. The responsibility for Christian education lies primarily at home and with the parents.

In how many modern homes do we find the family devotions slipping away. How can we expect our children to be morally responsible and spiritually inclined if their first teachers do not think that Christian living is important enough to practice?

We have pointed out a few of the shortcomings of the Church in carrying out this program, yet we must beware lest we fail to see our own insufficiencies. Let us say with Dr. Albertus C. Van Raalte. "This (Christian Education) is my Anchor of hope for this people in the future." But let us go one step beyond this statement and recognize that Christian education begins at home. It is up to us to see that our children are Christianized.

YOU HAVE NOTICED THAT ...

People put a low estimate on the man who puts too high an estimate on himself.

When some men run into a telephone pole, they always blame the pole.

Some people become round by eating square meals.

When an idler sees a completed job he is sure he could have done it better.

A man who says he can drink or let it alone usually drinks.

[210]

The Crown of Liberal Arts

JEAN CAVANAUGH

Marygrove College, Detroit, Michigan

A GREAT crown was ours when the first six days of creation were over. Man and woman were installed as king and queen of the earth and everything in it—king and queen because we alone possessed a special nature that guaranteed us the crown.

The world has really changed since those first days. We live now in the Age of Specialization, of mighty wheels of industry, of busy factories . . . Lost among the machinery are men and women who have given up the crown, because their education has made them specialists; their education has made them too much like the machines they operate. In spite of our great Industrial World, as individuals, we need not be lost behind the factory smokestacks; and as social beings, we need not be buried by the problems of our complex society. We need only to pursue the education that considers our full nature and develops our power to conquer these things. It is the broad education, it is Liberal Arts, that keeps us kings and queens, both as individuals and as members of society.

As individuals, our power to rule lies in our intellect. Sometimes that word carries an aversion or a fear, as if intellect were something that belonged only to a bespectacled professor, carrying a musty encyclopedia. No, that is not true. It is a great gift to each of us from One Who made us in His own image. Liberal Arts realizes the expansiveness of this gift and allows our intellect to contemplate all things. It is an education that develops the mind to approach our problems simply and directly; to look inside and understand ourselves; to make wise decisions at the crossroads and the milestones.

Miss Cavanaugh has finished her sophomore year at Marygrove College, Detroit, Mich.

Specialization cultivates the very opposite frame of mind. It confines all our interests and efforts into one channel, and it is this deliberate narrowing of our intellect that drops us into the realm of the animal kingdom. After all, the world's great specialists are the brute animals. No other living thing can make the honevcomb of the bee; no other creature can construct a dam so magnificently as the beaver; no other creature can weave a nest such as the bird builds. These specialists in the animal kingdom are beautiful to watch at work, because they are fulfilling their nature. Man, on the contrary, behind a machine, or as a highly specialized being only, is not beautiful to contemplate. We were never made to close our minds to all but a narrow part of the universe. Ours is the earth and everything that is in it. Our intellect needs philosophy and history and literature and sociology. In Liberal Arts these subjects all correlate to form a broader understanding of life and a good philosophy of living. This is the education that gives us our full dignity as individuals.

We have a social side to our nature, too. In order to rule as social beings, we need to understand society and have a sympathy with it. It is hard for Specialization to accomplish that end. Developing a single skill does not give sufficient time or place to understand society. Professional schools, law and medical colleges, prefer those who have had a good Liberal Arts education first. Why? . . . They have an understanding of the society in which they are going to work, an ability to see another's point of view, broader sympathies—things they do not get in specialization; yet, which are the very qualities that make a great lawyer or a great doctor. We all need those qualities of the lawyer and doctor, for not only they will work in society, but we all, as social beings, will work in the family and in the community; but always with our fellow beings.

To be a king and a queen, we have to stay on top of the problems of our society. To be benevolent rulers is not only staying on top of the problems, but working for their solution and seeking places to change society for a better and a happier place to live. Today is full of problems and undesirable social conditions. Family life could stand rebuilding. The divorce courts and juvenile judges are getting too much trade. The eco-

THE CROWN OF LIBERAL ARTS

nomic system still leaves too many without a decent paycheck. Communism and Socialism and false theories are spreading and taking hold where Truth is not there, being emphasized.

Only those who realize social responsibility and have the principles from which to work can possibly act as "leaven in the mass" or as "the salt of the earth." There is a place that develops these social-minded Good Samaritans. They are coming from the Liberal Arts college; and it is to them that society looks to show what our full nature can do. It takes a Liberal Arts education to feel heartily our social responsibility; it takes a Liberal Arts education to work on today's problems.

A great crown is ours if only education fulfills our whole nature. Inevitably, when the intellect is not imprisoned by specialization but is allowed to contemplate all things, it seeks and finds its height—in God; and when it fulfills this first great Commandment: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole mind"—then follows the second, like to this: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor."

Liberal Arts may well not only be holding our crown here, as rulers of the earth and everything in it, but may be opening the way to a more lasting one.

FAITH

Each dawn we step into a day Nor know what it may hold; We know not, yet we walk in faith For what it may unfold.

For they that walk with Christ must know Whate'er the path may be, His strength will lift them though they walk The waves of Galilee.

-Elizabeth Langerak

The Ethic of Self-Realization in Relation to Christian Education

HAROLD B. KUHN

THE STUDY of a philosophy of education cannot be pursued far until certain problems with respect to the development of the self are carefully considered. This necessitates in turn at least a general survey of the philosophy of the nature of man. The establishment of reasonable goals is basic to effective education, and no adequate set of goals can be formulated in the absence of some understanding of what the potentialities of human character are.

A survey of current educational reports impresses the reader with the preoccupation of educators with the proximate objectives of education, to the neglect of those ultimate objectives to which the Christian message seems to point. Much is being said concerning adjustment to society, concerning integration of thought, and concerning training toward active participation in the affairs of the social group. It is apparently taken for granted that in the process of achieving these objectives, the intrinsic possibilities of man's character will be realized.

The Romantic movement assumed that man could attain the peak of perfection, provided he could be properly educated and provided he were protected from the baneful influence of trammelling social institutions. The movement, with its primary emphasis upon the individual, sought to emancipate the self, and to open to it the dimensions which were felt to have been lost in Rationalism, with its emphasis upon universal principles and classical expression. It is Reinhold Niebuhr who points out that the individual self fared no better in Romanticism than in either Naturalism or Rationalism, in both of which human individuality is reduced to mere statistical distinctiveness. Thus the several directions

Dr. Kuhn heads the Department of Philosophy of Religion, Asbury Theological Seminary, Wilmore, Kentucky.

tions in which thought has moved since the Renaissance have tended either to submerge the self into some larger totality, or to reduce the concept of the self to mere numerical particularity.¹

The inadequacy of the contemporary understanding of the self renders impossible a proper understanding of what may be meant by 'self realization' considered as a goal of the educational process. In psychological theory the lack of an adequate concept of the self is expressed in Phenomenalism, which acknowledges no reality in mind, save in the existence of mental phenomena. It seems probable that the secular—or to quote Pitirim Sorokin the sensate—quality of modern culture springs from its lack of an understanding of the 'self' which does justice to the real dimensions of the human spirit, or from its confusion with respect to any clear view. Against this, the Soviet culture, which is the chief competitor of our western way of life, knows precisely what kind of self it seeks, and has integrated this phase of its thought with its total world-view. Thus while its understanding of the individual may, from our point of view, lack depth and dimension, at least it is clear and well-defined.

Against the comprehension of the self as mere numerical distinctness (and this has been the tendency in the West since the Renaissance) the Christian view of man involves a view of a God above this world, a relation to Whom true selfhood emerges. This view has not gone unchallenged, but has been compelled to struggle to maintain itself against newer trends in Anglo-Saxon culture which regard such investigations as those proposed by theology as superstitions and doomed to failure.² Against odds, however, Christianity has historically asserted the uniqueness of each individual self, the existence in each of a hard core of personal identity, and the existence of a frame of reference within which each individual must be understood which influences One to whom he is ultimately responsible.

In latter years, the Christian message has been compelled to struggle against the collectivist theologians who profess friendship for it. These latter have sought, in the name of social enlightenment, to minimize personal responsibility as attaching to the essential character of the 'self.'

¹Reinhold Niebuhr, The Nature and Destiny of Man, Vol. 1, pp. 74ff. ²Pitirim Sorokin, The Crisis of our Age, p. 100.

Having performed their most brilliant service by a study and exhibition of the nature of group sin, they insist that the follower of Christ is, both by nature and by conduct, caught so inextricably in the net of sin that there is no hope of his ever being untangled. Rather he should identify himself as intelligently as possible with the sinning collective, with its inevitable fate...³

To this manner of understanding the individual, personal relationship to God, personal concern over sin, personal devotion, and hope for personal salvation are treated sneeringly as unrealistic.

THIS attack upon the basic Christian view of man is in one sense more deadly than that which has come from modern mechanistic science. There are indications that the more marked forms of this latter movement have nearly run their course. In their place have come newer forms which seek to temper the materialistic currents within contemporary science in the direction of vitalistic evolution. This differs from the earlier Darwinian evolution in that it substitutes speculation and intuitive insight for the quest for a series of graded forms or for missing links. While it claims for its system a "God" who works from within the emergent process, and is thus, superficially at least, an improvement upon mechanistic evolution, it is yet to be demonstrated that the overall impact of its doctrines will be such as to exert any saving impact upon Christian theism.

Whether the newer conceptions of vitalism with respect to the self will contribute toward a better understanding of its dimensions than have the other secular movements since the Renaissance cannot now be determined. Some have already voiced the fear that Bergson's view of the superiority of impulse over discursive reason has given a bent to vitalism which will militate against any significant contribution toward a recapture of the Biblican understanding of the self. Claiming to rehabilitate freedom (from the low to which it sank in the era of mechanistic evolution), vitalism equates freedom with action according to intuition and/or im-

³Douglas V. Steere, On Beginning from Within, pp. xxif.

pulse, thus denaturing it. Without intelligence, freedom is a will o' the wisp.

From the foregoing it seems clear that a Christian philosophy of education will be compelled to declare itself at this vital point without the blessing of the major currents of contemporary thought. Christianity has again and again faced the necessity of affirming its basic tenets in the face of hostility from the prevailing Zeitgeist. Fortunate have been the times in which it has possessed the resources to do so.

Basic to the Christian understanding of the self is the frank recognition of human heteronomy—the recognition that man cannot be understood within the framework of his own relationships alone. To this view, man is not man primarily by virtue of his intrinsic properties, but in the light of his relation to a Higher Being, and in view of his moral and spiritual dependence upon this Being. In other words, man becomes a self in the light of God, with reference to Whom he possesses "the distinctive depth of spirit" wherein inheres real moral and spiritual character.

This raises the problem of the relation of the godless and the unregenerate to essential 'selfhood.' It cannot be denied that many who make no place for God in their thinking exhibit remarkable dimension of spirit, and that by comparison with their attainments the achievements of many regenerate persons appear small indeed. This is a fact which calls attention to the inadequacy of human yard-sticks for the task of true measurement of the human spirit. Here as nowhere else we find ourselves in difficulty in the matter of securing for our limited minds God's point of viewing.

Christian education is constantly in need of reminders at the point of her task of challenging the merely this-worldy scale of values with the Christian ideal of the futility of gaining any proximate end at the price of the loss of the soul. The self, seen from this point of vantage, is something more than a particular, an individual. It is an emergent from a situation in which the finite acknowledges the higher claim of the Infinite. This is a difficult saying; many will not be able to bear it. It challanges our contemporary humanism, and rocks us back upon our heels by insisting upon the priority of the things which are unseen and eternal.

The most obvious implication of this is that self realization,

in the Christian sense of the term, can be achieved only at a level which does justice to this enlarged view of the self. Essential to such self realization must be a coming to grips with the supertemporal and supersensory reference, in the light of which man becomes invested with true personality, in place of being a "mere complex of electrons and protons, an animal organism, a reflex mechanism, a variety of stimulus-response relationships, or a psychonalytical 'bag' filled with physiological libido.4

It follows that the entire question must be pushed back further than is commonly thought, that the human problem must be faced in the light of God's sun rather than that of the candle of man. In other words, no adequate comprehension of man is possible in the absence of an intelligent and vigorous application of the theistic postulate. It is disturbing to note the timidity of theists at the point of their central assertions. They have been overpowered, it seems, by the weight of opinion against them, so that a frank declaration of the existence of God and of His relevance to man is undertaken only with fear and trembling. In this respect Protestantism has compared unfavorably with Roman Catholicism, with its unswerving and united assertion of the essentially theocentric character of its philosophy in general, and of its philosophy of education in particular.

It goes without saying that Protestants must take a restrained view of the rationalism in Catholic theology. While we recognize the value of the classical proofs as offering strong presumptive evidence for God's existence, Protestantism must stop short of the assertion that reason demonstrates that existence, if by this we mean that it gives demonstration which is parallel to—for instance—mathematical certainty. At the same time, the classic Protestant view of Scripture affords a more certain ground for the unequivocal assertion of the theistic postulate. Is it not timely, then, for Protestantism to shake off her timidity, and to become vocal at the point of her central assertions?

E SSENTIAL to the formulation of her basic positions is a decision at the point of man's present moral condition in relation to the original and the ultimate purposes of God. Historic

⁴Sorokin, op. cit., pp. 100f.

Christianity has been thoroughly in accord with the biblical dictum that "the heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked."5 Theological liberalism has held, on the other hand, that man is born into the world in a condition of moral health, or at least that he is morally neutral by nature, and thus capable of a normal development into the life of godliness without special divine aid. To be sure, the child is thought to be born with a set of moral capacities capable of either divine or demonic development. The direction taken will depend upon the manner in which the original nature is affected by the environmental pattern.6 It may fairly be said that this position conditions, not only contemporary religious education, but general American educational theory as well.

It is probable that contemporary psychology is still on the outer fringes of critical study of the subconscious. For this reason, it is impossible at present to assess the degree to which the thought of Freud and his associates will serve to modify contemporary thinking concerning human nature. While the Christian message does not stand or fall with the approval or disapproval of current scholarship, its advocates are justfied in welcoming such aid and comfort as may come from this quarter. And the newer psychology has certainly levelled a severe blow at both the belief in the essential goodness of man and the position that he is morally neutral. Nevertheless, these views remain the dominant concepts in today's educational theory.

Both of them find within the self the capacities which the total educative processes may hope to bring to realization. The goal is thus relative only to the learner; life is achievement and attainment. There are no absolute failures, but only greater or lesser degrees of success. The emphasis comes to be laid upon process rather than the achievement of fixed objectives. It goes without saying that life is a series of reconstructions of experience, each leading to successive degrees of achievement. What is lacking in so much of educational theory is the element of ultimate goals. This will appear more clearly in the light of the following definitions of educational objectives.

⁵Jeremiah 17:9. ⁶Harrison S. Elliott, Can Religious Education be Christian? p. 191.

The Columbia College report suggests that

Our first business is to create that awareness, to post the roads of learning so that a student may recognize the continuity of the explosive present with the historical past, and may intelligently use that knowledge—within the allowances of the gods—to develop his own later usefulness and happiness.

The Harvard Report suggests the goal in terms of the development of: (1) ability to think effectively; (2) ability to communicate thought; (3) ability to make relevant judgments; and (4) ability to discriminate among values. President Henderson of Antioch College defines the purposes of liberal education as providing opportunity for students to: (1) enlarge and mature in their interests; (2) enrich and mature their philosophy of life; and (3) develop greater personal and social effectiveness. The Bennington College plan sees the goal as the cultivation of abilities and interests which conduce to cooperative and intelligent living. The University of Minnesota General College Bulletin suggests the aim of general education in terms of providing for

the development of the common understandings, abilities, insights, and appreciations for the personal and social activities basic to normal human living and par-

ticipation in a democratic society.8

These declarations of purpose have as a common denominator a concern for the development of patterns of personal and societal behavior which shall contribute to wholesome and constructive human living. Each shares a basic dynamism of outlook; possibly this is necessary, since goals stated in operational terms lend themselves better to appraisal than more static objectives. At the same time, they seem to leave the major issues untouched, for in making the integration of the individual into the social group the primary end, they give no concern to the ultimate ends of human life as these are set forth in the Christian message. To be sure, Jesus Christ was concerned with effective social living as a test and demonstration of discipleship; but no educational goal can be adequate to Christian standards which overlooks the claims of the

⁷COLUMBIA REPORT: A College Program in Action, p. 91. ⁸Minnesota General College Bulletin, p. 1

THE ETHICS OF SELF REALIZATION IN CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

life to come, or which is antagonistic at the point of God's design for man's disorder.

Current philosophies of education have much in common with classical eudaemonism, especially at the point of their insistence upon the necessity of temporal goods in the achievement of man's highest ends. Aristotle's classic statement has a strangely modern sound:

Happiness plainly requires external goods; for it is impossible, or at least not easy, to act nobly without some furniture of fortune. There are many things that can be done only through instruments, so to speak, such as friends and wealth and political influence; and there are some things whose absence takes the bloom off our happiness, as good birth, the blessing of children, personal beauty. Happiness, then, seems to stand in need of this kind of prosperity.9

In common with Aristotle, modern educators seem to agree that the great end of life is to be achieved by the identification of the self with some major social objective. The end of such living is to be understood in terms of the happiness which proceeds from such high social behavior.

All of this, magnificent as it appears, is nevertheless distinctly earth-bound. In the background stands the ideal man: the urbane, well proportioned and magnanimous person, exercising his pattern of healthy functions in a balanced life devoted to wide and inclusive social ends. The end of such a life is a type of happiness which is far beyond mere pleasure. Few will deny that this view does make a better attempt to deal realistically with human nature as containing mixed moral tendencies than does any system which seeks to understand man as by nature morally neutral. At the same time, Christianity has historically asserted that while evil serves by indirection to bring out man's finest possibilities (this being effected through his resistence to it), yet it is much more than that. Realism at this point involves the belief that sin has penetrated the very core of human

Aristotle: The Nichomachean Ethics

personality, and has so affected the proper potentialities of man that no development of latent possibilities alone can bring man to perfection.

THESE considerations serve to underscore that which was noted earlier, that current philosophies of education (apart from those which are frankly Christian) rise no higher than ancient philosophies of self-realization. Non-evangelical views, ancient and modern, are in such singular agreement because of a common sharing of an impoverished view of the self. Even in those cases in which a more realistic view is taken of the evil phases of human nature, there is a lack of an adequate standard of reference by which evil becomes evil. In other words, it is difficult if not impossible to understand evil save by reference to a transcendental standard of morality. It is at this point that the Christian message is most clear—in its assertion that back of human life lies a pattern of divinely-given mandates, and that these are communicated to man through Revelation.

The fundamental basis for the Christian treatment of the self is the principle, that man's disorders are rooted in soil deeper than his societal relationships. He is fundamentally out of joint. This he may not wish to acknowledge; indeed, it may be that denials of the existence of God are oblique attempts to solve a problem by ignoring it. Coupled with the Christian assertion of the essentially sinful quality of unregenerate human nature (and this view is coming to be accepted by many who own no allegiance to Christianity) is the belief in its modifiability. It goes without saying that historic Christianity goes beyond the theoretical assertion of the modifiability of man, to the assertion of the absolute necessity of his moral transformation through Grace, if man is to find a realization of his potentialities.

Such a point of view will obviously have the most profound repercussions in a philosophy of education. It will involve a thorough-going application of the Christian theistic postulate to the entire area of human learning, which will in turn demand a revision of the basic concepts underlying educational theory. This would involve a re-thinking of the question of ultimates, a scrapping of some types of metaphysics, a new orientation for anthropol-

ogy, a revision of psychology, and a move toward objectivism in ethics.

More significant still, it would imply an abandonment of the romantic confidence in the essential adequacy of youth and of the general optimism with which man's deeper life is regarded. In other words, such a return to historic Christian principles would reawaken interest in the matter of the loss which man sustained in his fall, particularly as this loss affects negatively his possibilities for self-realization. Reinhold Niebuhr has made a penetrating statement at this point.

The real evil in the human situation . . . lies in man's unwillingness to recognize and acknowledge his weakness, finiteness and dependence of his position, . . . and in his effort to pretend a virtue and knowledge which are beyond the limits of mere creatures . . . ¹⁰

The result of such a situation is that man finds himself vitiated in his moral abilities, and at the same time able to idealize imaginatively a transcending of his abilities. Now, his ability to plan has also suffered through his fall, for he certainly does not set the noble ends for himself and his society that he would have done had not sin marred his vision. At the same time, there is a tragic margin between his ability to plan and his power to execute. This poses the problem: by what means can he reduce this margin to tolerable width? It is the task of the Christian philosophy of education to provide some adequate solution to the question.

The classic non-evangelical answer to the problem is that proposed by Horace Bushnell and his successors, who seek to show that through 'Christian Nurture' the child may find the essentially Christian nature within himself gently cultivated. In consequence it is expected that he enter Christianhood without any consciousness of having been other than a Christian. It may be questioned whether this essentially romantic view is defensible in the light of newer knowledge.

The discrepancy between man's ability to plan and his power to execute is a manifestation of the deeper reality, that through sin man is deprived of the intrinsic capacity for the achievement of that which the self promises and projects. Man's unregenerate state is thus paradoxical: it holds forth bright promises of significant and meaningful self-fulfillment and at the same time subverts the means by which these ends are attained.

The Christian message strikes at the citadel of personality—of the self—and proposes to effect a transformation whereby the self is delivered from the disharmonious and disruptive tensions created by sin. The self finds a new dimension: it begins to live in terms of God and not primarily in terms of the shrunken limits of merely human life. Followers of the newer psychology make much of the similarity between Christian conversion and psychological integration. It is true that regeneration does bring a unification of the inner life around a new center. Christianity must, however, differ with current psychology at the points of its mode of understanding the level at which integration occurs, and of the explanation of the integrative work.

Whereas the psychology of integration insists that the self latterly becomes unified around some intrinsic central core (and the definition of precisely what this core is, is still largely unformulated), historic Christianity insists that in regeneration there is imparted a radically new principle of life, and that the self now becomes organized around a transformed center. It is willing to follow contemporary psychology of religion in its research into Christian conversion so long as the latter contents itself with remaining a descriptive science, and so long as it resists the temptation to explain such conversion upon purely natural causes. Historic Christianity is convinced, however, that nothing which current psychology can advance will invalidate the biblical teaching that the new birth is like the wind which bloweth where it listeth, whereof men hear the sound but cannot tell whither it cometh or goeth.

It must be recognized, of course, that the immediate effects of applied Christianity issue in part from causes beyond the educational process. At the same time, the development of regenerate men and women must be ever a long range objective of the educational system. In a survey of the adequacy of aims, no

¹⁰⁰p. cit., p. 137.

THE ETHICS OF SELF REALIZATION IN CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

consideration of self-fulfillment can do justice to the Christian message without taking into account the new dimensions of the self which are revealed in the consideration of applied redemption, and without recognizing that it is Grace which reveals the true character and size of the self.

BITING ONESELF

They tell me that if a rattlesnake is cornered it will become so angry that it will bite itself. That is exactly what the harboring of hate and resentment against others is—a biting of oneself. We think that we are harming others in holding these spites and hates, but the deeper harm is to ourselves.

-E. Stanley Jones

Timothy Coop, an American farmer, was noted for his generosity. When asked how he could afford to give so much, he replied, "I shovel out as God shovels in, and the Lord's shovel is larger than mine."

That church service is a failure from which people go out thinking about the minister and forgetting about God.

Prayer while we run is to be commended, of course, but praying before we have to run is usually better.

Aims of College Courses In Religion

L. B. MATTHEWS

THERE IS a story of a group of western explorers traveling in one of the world's more backward sections. In the absence of modern means of transportation natives were carrying the luggage on their backs. After several days of rather rapid marching, one morning these natives refused to move. On being asked through an interpretor why, they said that they were waiting for their souls to catch up with them. This is probably a truer parable of our modern life than even we would like to believe. Certainly the last few years have brought unbelievable and, for some of us, incomprehensible scientific development. We cannot call a scientific halt, and so we must sponsor a spiritual advance. This is being called for as our only hope by even the political and scientific leaders themselves.

In several recent public addresses and magazine articles Mr. John Foster Dulles has urged America, if we would show Communist Russia that we are not on the verge of internal collapse, to re-emphasize those principles and ideals that have made America great. And first among them he puts faith in God, since the belief in God and a desire for religious freedom were basic in the founding of our country. Thus we find an international lawyer pleading for a revival of the Christian religion in our national life.

The attitude of the scientists may be taken from the words of Dr. Arthur H. Compton, the great physicist and Nobel-prize winner. His friend, President Marsh of Boston University, quotes him as saying: "Of course, the real answer is 'Bibles' not 'bombs'. The only long distance answer is that of teaching people the great law of God—of the forces that shape life in the world.

Dr. Matthews is Professor of Religion, Franklin College, Franklin, Indiana.

AIMS OF COLLEGE COURSES IN RELIGION

That law is that people must learn to work together, that each needs the other for his own best life. As ',the love of your neighbor' is made a part of your lives, the possibilities of war will fade into the distance." Could a religionist express our need more strongly than has Dr. Compton?

Yet this attitude was set forth by Daniel Webster as he said: "If we abide by the principles taught in the Bible, our country will go on prospering and to prosper; but, if we and posterity neglect its instruction and authority, no man can tell how sudden a castrophe may overwhelm and bury all our glory in profound obscurity."

Andrew Jackson, the Old Hickory of hero worshippers, said of the Bible: "That Book, Sir, is the rock on which our Republic rests."

It should be quite clear that a knowledge of the Bible is a must for those who would understand the genius of America, and who would be equipped to defend and perpetuate Americanism. Our Declaration of Independence, Constitution, and Bill of Rights rest on the Bible's teaching of man's kinship to God, and of his eternal worth because of that origin. Man has certain inalienable rights and any education, whether public or private, that fails to emphasize these basic facts is building its house on the sand.

But due to a new emphasis on the doctrine of the separation of Church and State, to a materialist trend in education, and to an inadequate training in both home and church, our colleges and universities are confronted with the almost impossible task of giving spiritual dynamic and purpose to life. It is the task of showing our youth that there is a God who is both Creater and Father—as Creator the one who provides us with the physical forces of nature, and as Father the one who provides us with the spiritual power to use them aright.

Courses in religion and the point of view in which they are presented must be kept abreast of the best thinking in other fields. Professors of religion will not teach science. But we shall help students understand that in the beginning was God, and that as we discover the principles of the universe we are but thinking God's thoughts after him. We shall not claim the Bible as a

book of history. But we shall show how its teachings and principles have both inspired and judged the leaders who have made history. We shall not teach sociology. But we can point out that "When Moses was grown . . . he went out unto his brethren, and looked on their labors." And we shall try to lead students to a spiritual maturity that will cause them to go out unto their brethren, and to look on their burdens of ignorance, disease, poverty, race and class hatred, and all the attitudes and beliefs that dwarf and crush the bodies and souls of men. With such teaching modern Moses' will lead their brethren from whatever may enslave them.

Our students should become acquainted with the main characters of the Bible, and see in their experiences and convictions those laws of life that are equally true for all ages. It would be foolish to try to identify the "forbidden fruit" with any specific one in our gardens. But we should see in that story that prohibition is written in the very heart of the universe. All about us are the warnings: You may do this and this and this, but you may not do that, and in the day that you do it you shall surely die. If youth can but realize this truth, deaths on the highways will be practically eliminated; the drive of sex, instead of leading to debauchery and moral ruin, will build homes and rear children in an environment akin to heaven; and the highest moral and ethical laws of society will be followed, since we have no right to misuse our brother or take that which rightfully belongs to him.

In the story of Cain we can see that we are our brother's keeper, and that his welfare and happiness are indissolubly linked with our own. In the story of the flood we can see the judgment and fall of even the proud nations today that forget God. Abraham had the faith of the religious pioneers who settled America. He was told: "I will bless thee, and thou shalt be a blessing." And the experience of Abraham's descendants should teach Americans an unforgettable lesson. In the stories of the birth and marriage of Isaac there is a trust in God that would save our American home. The entire life of Jacob but exemplifies the law "Whatsoever a man soeth that shall he also reap." The experiences of Joseph show that even gold to be useful must be refined by the fires of discipline and self-sacrifice. For centuries the gov-

AIMS OF COLLEGE COURSES IN RELIGION

ernments and laws of all civilized countries have recognized the Mosaic Law, and its principles are still basic in both our ethics and our religion. The courage and insight of the Hebrew prophets in condemning the social sins of their generation are still a model for our day.

In our college we make the Life and Teachings of Jesus the basic course, and the one required for freshmen. There are certain facts about the relation of the Gospels to each other, the groups of people in New Testament times, the geography and government, language and custom, that must be explained as a general background. But primarily it is the teaching of Jesus about which we are most concerned. The gospel comment as Jesus meets Levi clearly shows his chief interest-"And as Jesus passed by he saw a man." Wherever Jesus goes he is interested in people—Pharisees like Nicodemus, men of wealth as the rich young ruler and Joseph of Arimatha, women of Samaria and those taken in adultery, publicans like Zacheus, a thief dying on a cross, fishermen, and just common people like you and me. It was this interest in people, and his love for them, that brought Jesus into conflict with the Jewish leaders, and finally made the cross inevitable. Because Iesus loved people he put their needs before the ceremonial observance of a day. Thus he did not hesitate to heal on the Sabbath in violation of the Jewish tradition, since "The Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath." He refused to fast, because he and the disciples in bringing a new way of life to people were as happy as a wedding party. He drove from the temple the moneychangers and those trafficing in sacrificial animals, because he wanted it truly to be a house of prayer for all people. He warned men about trusting wealth, because inflation and depression can destroy its value, and because man is primarily spiritual. He healed men's bodies, but he also forgave their sins and gave them a purpose for living. This attitude of Jesus is finally summed up by the scoffers at the cross-"He saved others, himself he cannot save."

The student who sits at the feet of Jesus can quite naturally make as the prayer for his life:

Lord, help me live from day to day In such a self-forgetful way That even when I kneel to pray My prayer shall be for others. Others, Lord, yes, others, Let this my motto be, Help me to live for others, That I may live like Thee.

The Gospels present Jesus as teaching with such authority as to surprise his hearers, but they also present him as a man of prayer, deeply conscious of his dependence on the Father. He prayed all night before choosing the twelve. "He went up on the mountain to pray, and as he prayed he was transfigured before them." He prayed in Gethsemane and on Calvary. His prayer life so impressed the disciples that on one occasion, when he had finished praying, they said to him: "Lord, teach us to pray."

Jesus presents God as one who loves all mankind. He is like a shepherd concerned about one lost sheep, a woman about a lost coin, and a father about a wayward son. And, because God is like that, there is joy in heaven over one sinner who repents. He sums up all that is best in the Old Testament in complete love for God and for one's fellowman. Finally, he sends out to make disciples of all nations.

Courses in religion should first bring students into a vital spiritual experience, and then they should send those students out with the consciousness of a divine mission of service to mankind. We who teach these courses have a heavy responsibility.

A philosophy of life which involves no sacrifice turns out in the end to be merely an excuse for being the sort of person one is.

—T. S. Eliot.

Trends in Giving and Spending

JAMES A. McDILL

THE trends in giving and spending in the United States depend upon the personal income available to the people who spend and give, and, so far as giving is concerned, upon the spiritual motivation to share with others which our people feel.

WHAT DO WE HAVE?

First, then, who DO Americans have to spend and give?

The national income has been steadily rising ever since the bottom was reached in the depression of 1932. It has been rising, that is, with but one set back in 1938, until well into the current year of 1949, when the ascent appears to have been arrested.

But, the national income, pro-rated among our 143,382,000 population (July 1, 1947), for an "average annual income," is not exact enough as a designation of our benevolence resources.

The latest figures which are available are for the year 1947. As reported by the U. S. Department of Commerce in July 1948 (Survey of Current Business, Vol. 28, No. 7), the gross national product income of the year—some \$231,363 millions—included a corporation business income which when deducted leaves \$195,198 millions of "personal income." With income taxes taken out, the resulting "personal disposable income" would be \$173,577 millions. A further deduction of \$8,822 millions in personal savings for the year leaves \$164,755 millions of "personal consumption expenditures." Divided among the population, this figure reveals an average of \$1,149 for every man, woman, and child in our country. If we include savings and taxes, the average was 1,314.

Now, for any one denomination, if you will multiply this \$1,149 by your total membership for the year 1947, you can quickly figure what the "personal expenditure income" of the people of your church really was—and that figure is probably a minimum.

Mr. McDill is Associate Secretary of the Division of Church Relations, Presbyterian (U. S. A.) Board of Christian Education. Editor of Stewardship Facts, 1949 edition.

For example, the 2,203,323 members of our Presbyterian U. S. A. Church had, then, a minimum income of \$2,531,600,000, a tithe of which would amount to \$253,160,000, instead of the \$78,180,000 which we received for all funds of current expenses, special funds, and benevolences in 1947.

Yes, we have the money! What a breath-taking capital for the Kingdom of God would be available, if the members of any one of our communions could be moved to tithe and contribute one-tenth of their "personal disposable income" to the church! It would amount to \$114.90 per member, instead of the \$23.70 average for 16 churches, during the peak year of 1948.

It is interesting to note that for the past 28 years our giving "lags" behind trends in income by about two years. Our low ebb was not reached until 1934, although our national income had been lowest in 1932. The recovery and climb back of our benevolence-giving has been very much slower in both speed and amount than has been the rise in average income, which has been so much faster and greater.

WHAT ABOUT LARGE GIFTS?

"Can we depend on the large givers any more?" This is a question that has been asked repeatedly in the past few years by philanthropic organizations. For an answer we turn to the firm of Marts and Lundy, of New York City, directors of fund-raising programs for many years. In their pamphlet "The Outlook for Gifts" these people say:

"America is now experiencing the greatest era of voluntary giving to its educational, religious, health, and public service agencies in the history of the republic. Giving has been on the rise for the past ten years. When the returns for 1947 are in, all indications point to the probability that they will register the largest total voluntary giving in any single year in our history. It is quite probable that this total will be well over \$2,500,000,000.

"The increase in giving is general throughout all groups of income recipients; from those with incomes of less than \$1,000 a year, to those with incomes of over \$1,000,000 per year.

"Really large fortunes are accumulated by men who build a new idea or skill into an enlarging business. . . . Then, when they wish to make a large gift to a college or a church, they will probably make the gift in the stock of the corporation which has been the basis of their weath, at the present valuation of that stock. . . . Their giving will, in my opinion, increase in the months and years ahead."

TRENDS IN GIVING AND SPENDING

How Do WE SPEND OUR INCOME?

The complete details of our personal consumption expenditures, by type of product, from 1944 to 1947 are given in the "Survey of Current Business."*

From these figures, the following listing paints a realistic picture of how we as Americans actually express our regard for things through what we spend and give for them.

TABLE I

From \$164,755,000,000 of Personal Consumption. Expenditures in the United States in 1947. For a population of 143,382,000 on July 1, 1947.

Milli	ons of	Dollars
Alcoholic beverages	\$8,770	
Tobacco products and smoking supplies	3.880	
Jewelry and watches (not including repairs)	1,365	
Barbershop and beauty parlor services	1,151	
New and used automobiles	5,512	
Gasoline and oil	3,601	
Auto tires, tubes, parts, and accessories	1,685	
Admissions to motion pictures	1,380	
Radios, pianos, records, and musical instruments	1,393	
Non-durable toys and sports goods	1,008	
Pari-mutuel betting, net receipts	238	
ALL RELIGIOUS BODIES	884	4
Social welfare and foreign relief	685	

How Do WE GIVE?

Finally, what are the trends in giving as shown by the members of our Protestant churches?

The United Stewardship Council has been compiling these statistics for many years. The record of per capita giving from 1920 to 1948 is given below and is as accurate as the reports of the 16 constituent communions which have submitted their records for that length of time.

There is a definite upward trend in our giving. But while contributions have made substantial increase in the 1940s, they have not kept pace with the rise in personal income.

The needs of our churches are obvious. The financial resources of our members are adequate. We should expect higher contributions.

But we must turn to a deeper enthusiasm of evangelism and sense of stewardship to move people to give as they should.

^{*}Vol. 28, No. 7, July 1948, 30 cents.

Making a College More Christian

MYRON F. WICKE

It is not easy to make a college Christian. So incredibly difficult is it to do, in fact, that most colleges state their objectives as Christian, and almost let it go at that. But no high-ringing sentences in the college catalog are enough to settle the matter. It takes a good deal more than fine phrases. If, however, we are earnestly seeking to make our colleges more Christian, it is surprising how little direct action we apply to the problem. This paper is a brief attempt to explore one or two of the possibilities of direct action.

Several assumptions, consciously or unconsciously held, must first of all be dealt with, for each of these assumptions seems basically invalid. The first is that a college can be made Christian by requiring a course or two in religion. The teachers of these courses know too well that their efforts cannot do the whole job. They assume and hope, with reason, doubtless, that their courses are helpful to the cause of Christianizing the college. They know, however, that often the very fact that their courses are required religion has made them unpopular and at times even vigorously resented. It is all too clear that no required course in religion, or in any other area where the religion is being carefully smuggled in, will solve the problem of making a campus more Christian.

A second assumption is on its face equally naive. It is the notion, usually unconsciously held, that a campus will become Christian any more easily than it will remain solvent, or keep its academic standards high, exept by direct, concerted, and continued action. This is one problem which will not take care of itself; rather it will demand all the ingenuity we can bring to it, and all the vigor.

The third assumption has always been the most popular of the three, the most frequently stated, and only occasionally the most carefully executed. It is the idea that by hiring Christian

Dr. Wicke is Secretary of the Department of Higher Education in the Methodist Board of Education, Division of Educational Institutions.

MAKING A COLLEGE MORE CHRISTIAN

faculty members we have at least avoided the worst dangers of un-Christian education. Perhaps we have in this way averted the most obvious possibilities, but we have fallen into the serious error of assuming that nominal Christians on our faculty will make our courses as Christian as possible.

There is, of course, infinitely more to the problem than is involved in the curriculum and the facutly alone. The spirit of the administration has much to do with it; faculty-administration relationships are important; student-faculty relationships are crucial; and so also are such matters as fraternities, athletics, admissions, dormitory life—in fact, nearly everything that is to be found on a campus. But this paper will be concerned mainly with the curricular problems involved, since it may be that these are the least often carefully considered.

The curriculum of a Christian college should show unmistakably that it is Christian. Such a curriculum is more easily planned than delivered. But it is clear that not nearly enough thought has been going into the planning of it; and that therefore we could not look for delivery. There is no reason, first of all, why a Christian college should not require courses dealing specifically with religion, for religion is one of the great disciplines of mankind. There is much reason why not all our hopes should be placed upon these courses exclusively. Two courses which appear almost essential to any sound Christian curriculum are Bible and philosophy. We cannot afford to neglect the greatest of all books. The logical time for Bible is in the freshman year, and for two reasons. The college needs to raise its Christian banners as early as possible. Again, some students remain in college for but one year. A course in Bible is of great potential value to this one-year student. At once we come to faculty problems. If any course needs powerful, dynamic teaching, this one does. No college can afford to have any but the best teaching for this course, if-and the word needs reiteration-if the college proposes to be Christian.

The required course in philosophy belongs in the senior year, for nearly the reverse reason suggested for having Bible in the freshman year. If religion should initiate the work of a student

in a Christian college, this course should cap it. The senior philosophy course ought to become the cap-stone of the four years' work. It can be made the integrative factor of the entire curriculum, linking and re-evaluating the importance of the sciences, the social sciences, the humanites, and religion. It must be a course that demands much of the student; it will require far more of the instructor. The ideal course in senior philosophy has not been built, but it is in the process of development in a number of places. Like Bible, this one too will allow for only superlative teaching.

These two courses will, to be sure, greatly enrich a curriculum: but emphatically again, they will not of themselves solve our problem. For they are at most only a small part of the total academic work of a student. Therefore the whole curriculum needs vigorous and constant attention. If only two or three courses deal directly with religion, all courses are indirectly responsible for the Christian influence of a campus. One principle is so obvious that it hardly needs statement. Nevertheless, it is often neglected in practice mainly because of ignorance of the facts. No courses may be tolerated on a Christian campus which are anti-Christian in material or in attitude. It is utterly useless to require a course in Christian philosophy to overcome the effects of another course on the same campus which denies in one way or another basic Christian ideals. The student will be subtly tempted to assume that the religion course, since it is a required one, is special pleading as compared to some other course he finds more scientific or objective. Yet it is not at all unusual to find exactly this situation on some of our campuses. This is no plea for censorship of material, or for any other kind of violation of essential academic freedom. It is a reminder that we cannot ourselves nourish our enemies and still expect to win victories. If the day ever comes when we cannot find men and women of strong Christian conviction to teach all the essential courses in a firstrate curriculum because Christians cannot honestly hold to their Christian principles and to their intellectual honesty as well, then indeed the day has come to renounce Christian colleges as impossible of achievement.

MAKING A COLLEGE MORE CHRISTIAN

But if it is agreed that no anti-Christian courses can be admitted, are there additional steps to develop properly our curricula? First of all, a continuing and carefully guided examination of the entire curriculum by the whole faculty is absolutely necessary. It is, of course, an axiom that any college worth its salt will be continually studying its curriculum. This study will need to begin with a consideration and re-statement of college aims and objectives. These must express as clearly as possible the total goals of the faculty and administration. They must represent mutual ideals, not the ideals alone of the president or dean; for unless the objectives seem desirable and attainable to the men and women from day to day on the academic firing-line, they will not have the support of these men and women who have the responsibility of implementing the objectives.

The next step will need to involve intensive department-bydepartment studies of course content and emphasis. Two major questions consistently demand answer. First, is there any part of this course which is antagonistic to Christian principles? Second, are there opportunities in this course to strengthen Christian thinking, opportunities which I am neglecting?

Even faculty members will be astonished to discover that their own courses offer strange answers to both questions. They will make discoveries when they have been again and again alerted to the unique aims of the Christian college. We all forget so easily, and we all forget so much. It should be pointed out at once, and emphatically, that this does not mean elimination from courses of study those ideas which are contrary to Christian doctrine. Ideas must always be faced, never run away from. The ideas a teacher may decide to ignore may be also the very ideas which trouble or impress a student. And college students are quickly alive to any attempted sidestepping of basic issues. The question is always one of interpretation, and of attitude towards ideas; it is not a question of ignoring the ideas.

A case in point may help to clarify. There is every reason why a modern college curriculum should include work in recent literature. The Hardys, the Dreisers, and even the Gertrude Steins have left their mark upon our culture; and to ignore them is perilous, since students do not ignore them. The fact is that

the books of Theodore Dreiser are dramatic illustrations of the emptiness of modern pseudo-scientific mechanism, and it is not very difficult to demonstrate this emptiness. On the other hand, a Christian college which officially acquiesces, through the person of an English instructor, in the deadly doctrines of Theodore Dreiser, is failing to recognize its opportunities.

Without attempting a detailed analysis of the curriculum problem as it is found from one department to another, certain points of tension may be suggested. The teaching of psychology offers today unusual occasions for difficulty. This is one of the major battlegrounds for the Christian college, and the battle may be lost before it is realized even by the psychology faculty. Psychology is so plausible, so exciting, so apparently relevant.

The sciences, again, have always been potentially the most helpful to the Christian point of view, but still so often unwittingly harmful. Two attitudes are most to be suspected. The first, and if the evidence is to be believed the most common, is the attitude that science is an area in which all the facts are evident and indisputable, and that religion, by contrast, is an area in which nothing can be demonstrated and everything must be accepted by a sort of 'gritting the teeth and believing' what is obviously unlikely. It is unfortunate that many scientists unconsciously adopt exactly this point of view, and by their naive and somewhat pious, dualism place religion completely on the defensive. The second attitude is nearly as harmful, and quite as indefensible, when it seems to imply that there are almost no limitations to the scientific method. A sound science course ought to develop, at least, the notion that the sciences have severe and final limitations. And while we may have no Jeanses or Edingtons in our classrooms, we still have men and women, and we must find more, who can develop the positive opportunities for religious thinking in a study of the sciences. Parenthetically, it may be impossible to hope for such impressive contributions from science courses until we abandon more widely the stupid "cook-book" technique involved in so many standard laboratory courses.

The social sciences offer potential dangers and potential values of almost immeasurable consequences. Especially is this the case in the teaching of sociology and of economics, but history offers

MAKING A COLLEGE MORE CHRISTIAN

some of the same problems. Here arises, of course, the question of the Christian's attitude towards management and labor, capitalism and socialism, and even towards communism. issues must be faced sooner or later. The answers may not, however, please either the socialists or the capitalists, nor will there possibly be but one answer to any of the questions.

Several other considerations must be faced, though they are not quite parallel to what has gone before. The music department of a Christian college has a tremendous opportunity to influence in a dynamic way the cultural lives of its students, and the same may be said of departments of dramatics. It seems doubtful, at this point, that any Christian college can go on "practical" record as sponsoring, by presenting publicly, some of the more meretriciously vulgar of modern plays. The question is not one of academic freedom, for all types of plays may merit close and scientific consideration in a college class. But that a Christial college should appear to sponsor dramatic vulgarity in public appearances, for whatever secondary reasons, is highly dubious.

Finally, a word is necessary regarding the college chapel. The institution known historically as chapel, now including also what may be known as assembly, offers an almost unparalleled opportunity to the Christian college. The carelessness with which many colleges have accepted this responsibility is little short of scandalous, and it is the sign of the nonchalant way the whole problem of the Christianity of our colleges has been faced. The chapel needs as much attention as does any department of the college. It needs enough money to be properly equipped and to be properly financed. It needs the best direction that can be found for it, direction which will apply a good deal of time, imagination. and personality. But most of all it needs to be integrated into the entire curricular program, to be brought, as has been said. into the 'main tent,' to be elevated from the place of a mere sideshow. Too often the chapel program gets whatever money is left after whatever seems more important has been cared for; and it gets whatever direction is left after all classes have been assigned. A new ideal needs to be applied here. Chapel ought to be regarded as a splended integrating opportunity. Here ideas are brought before the whole campus family, including and em-

phasizing ideas, and here they are linked with what has been studied in day-to-day classes in history, economics, English, and psychology. The chapel of the Christian college can become a surprisingly vital force.

All administrators of Christian colleges are faced with the terrible and recurring question: Where shall be found teachers who can do what a Christian college must demand of them, and where can they be found for the salaries the college can afford to pay? The graduate schools have produced far too few impressive teachers, and even fewer impressive Christian teachers. Perhaps the latter is not their responsibility. And money for salaries is more easily spent than found. Nevertheless, if improvement must wait upon ideal conditions, the improvement will never take place. Rather we must begin where we are, and with the faculty and equipment we have. Of one thing we may be certain. There will be no Christian college where there is not first of all an intelligent shouldering of the responsibility of being Christian, and where there is not as well a determination to become in truth what we pretent to be in our public utterances and what we publicize in our catalogs.

GETTING OLD

A church announced that it would hold a special communion service for the young people between the ages of 144 and 25. That should be a great life to those of us who have had the feeling that we are no longer qualified for membership in the youth or student group.